COLUMBIA RIVER GORGE

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

THE COLUMBIA RIVER GORGE

FEBRUARY 10, 1983

Serial No. 98-7

Printed for the use of the
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

17-868 O
U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1983

S261-24

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

BOB PACKWOOD, Oregon, *Chairman*

BARRY GOLDWATER, Arizona
JOHN C. DANFORTH, Missouri
NANCY LANDON KASSEBAUM, Kansas
LARRY PRESSLER, South Dakota
SLADE GORTON, Washington
TED STEVENS, Alaska
BOB KASTEN, Wisconsin
PAUL S. TRIBLE, Jr., Virginia

ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, South Carolina
RUSSELL B. LONG, Louisiana
DANIEL K. INOUYE, Hawaii
WENDELL H. FORD, Kentucky
DONALD W. RIEGLE, Jr., Michigan
J. JAMES EXON, Nebraska
HOWELL HEFLIN, Alabama
FRANK R. LAUTENBERG, New Jersey

WILLIAM M. DIEFENDERFER, *Chief Counsel*
RALPH B. EVERETT, *Minority General Counsel*

CONTENTS

Page

Opening statement by the Chairman ... 1

LIST OF WITNESSES

Breckel, Jeffrey, director, Oregon Columbia Gorge Commission, and Washington Columbia Gorge Commission ... 9
  Prepared statement ... 14
Buchanan, Dennis, county executive, Multnomah County, Oreg.; Eric Hovee, manager, economic development, Vancouver, Wash.; and James Burke, senior economist, Pacific Economica ... 51
  Prepared statement of Mr. Buchanan ... 55
  Prepared statement of Mr. Hovee ... 59
  Letter of February 9, 1983 ... 62
Burnett, Howard, Union Pacific Railroad ... 33
  Prepared statement ... 35
Eads, Shirley A., State travel director, Oregon Department of Transportation.. 3
  Prepared statement ... 7
Hemingway, William, Mid-Columbia Marketing and Columbia Gorge Visitors' Association; Jim Carpenito, president, Columbia Gorge United; and William Benson, county commissioner, Skamania County, Wash ... 38
  Prepared statement of Mr. Carpenito ... 46
Lindstrom, Stephen, Pacific Northwest Waterways ... 26
Luce, Charles ... 18
Russell, Nancy, Friends of the Columbia Gorge; Charles Williams, Columbia Gorge Coalition; Mary K. McCurdy, Oregon chapter, Sierra Club; Don Hall, Vancouver Audubon Society; and John A. Charles, executive director, Oregon Environmental Council ... 67
  Prepared statement of Mr. Williams ... 75
Warman, Allan, Mid-Columbia Economic Development District ... 20
  Prepared statement ... 23

ADDITIONAL ARTICLES, LETTERS, AND STATEMENTS

Adlard, Dick, letter of February 24, 1983 ... 114
Alverts, Robert L., chairman, Oregon Society of American Foresters, letter of February 22, 1983 ... 113
Barnes, Robert W., letter of February 18, 1983 ... 113
Benson, Jerry, president, Mens Garden Club of Portland, letter of February 4, 1983 ... 101
Bishop, B. H., Pendleton Woolen Mills, letter of February 4, 1983 ... 101
Bishoprikc, Stanley, chairman, Protect the Gorge Committee, letter of February 10, 1983 ... 109
Bray, Barbara L., Columbia River Gorge Scenic Area, letter of September 10, 1982 ... 98
Burnet, Patricia L., letter of February 9, 1983 ... 105
Chapin, F. Stuart, Jr., statement ... 93
Clausen, Phyllis, letter of September 10, 1982 ... 98
Committee to Preserve Property Rights in the Columbia River Gorge, statement ... 94
Esch, Curtis and Sherry, letter of February 7, 1983 ... 104
Gorge Defense League to the People, statement ... 89
Gregg, Philo, Industrial Forestry Association, letter of February 25, 1983 ... 116
Hobson, Kenneth D., city administrator, city of Cascade Locks, statement ... 97
Izaak Walton League of America, Inc., Oregon Division, statement ... 87

Page
Jemtegaard, Marvin A. and Lois C., letter of February 10, 1983 99
Jorgensen, C. Glen, letter of February 12, 1983 111
Karlsson, Karl E., letter of 101
Leick, Robert K., statement 90
Macht, William P., William P. Macht Associates, letter of February 10, 1983 ... 109
Mason, Mary B., Chair Trails Clubs of Oregon, letter of February 8, 1983 104
McGough, Ben H., Jr., M.D., Vancouver Orthopedic Group, P.S., letter of September 8, 1982 98
Metzger, Chlovena B., statement 97
O'Banion, Tina, manager, Hood River County Chamber of Commerce, letter of February 4, 1983 102
Olwine, Anne, letter of February 9, 1983 105
Ott, Anna, letter of 100
Palmer, Glenn E., commissioner, Hood River County, letter of February 10, 1983 105
Pierce, Alex, president, Oregon Roadside Council, letter of February 24, 1983 .. 115
Prosch, Doug, statement 92
Ross, Richard N., letter of February 12, 1983 112
Rush, Donna, secretary/treasurer, Stevenson Business Association, letter of February 7, 1983 102
Schrock, Richard T., director, State of Washington Commerce & Economic Development, letter of February 10, 1983 107
Seyl, Susan, statement 87
Skousen, Joel, chairman, Stop Taking Our Property, letter of February 7, 1983 102
Stroller, Elsie, conservation chairman, Mt. St. Helens Club, letter of February 11, 1983 110
Upson, U. L., letter with statement of February 10, 1983 107
Vasbinder, Gerald, letter of 100
Willard Women's Club, statement 89

COLUMBIA RIVER GORGE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1983

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION,
Hood River, Oreg.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m. in the Columbia Room, Hood River Inn, Hood River, Oreg., Hon. Bob Packwood [chairman] presiding.

Staff members assigned to this hearing: Dennis J. Phelan, staff counsel and John D. Hardy, minority staff counsel.

OPENING STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The reason I have delayed is that there is a larger crowd here than we expected, and a number of people have asked for the witness list. Unfortunately, as we were copying it, the machine broke down. We hope to have some more copies of the witness list for distribution soon.

But let me read the list, and then as we get the actual copies here we will distribute them. The witnesses will go in this order: Shirley Eads, the director of tourism for the State of Oregon; Jeff Breckel, executive director of the Oregon Columbia Gorge Commission and the Washington Columbia Gorge Commission; and, Charles Luce, former administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration.

Then, in a panel, Allan Warman of the Mid-Columbia Economic Development District; Steve Lindstrom of the Pacific Northwest Waterways Association; Howard Burnett, Union Pacific Railroad.

Next panel: Bill Hemingway of the Mid-Columbia Marketing; Jim Carpenito of Columbia Gorge United; and, William Benson, Skamania County Commissioner.

The panel after that: Dennis Buchanan, county executive, Multnomah County; Eric Hovee, economic development manager for the city of Vancouver; and, James Burke of Pacific Economica.

The last panel will be: Nancy Russell of Friends of the Columbia Gorge; Charles Williams, Columbia Gorge Coalition; Mary McCurdy of the Sierra Club; Don Hall of the Vancouver Audubon Club; and, John Charles of the Oregon Environmental Council.

We had over 200 requests for people to testify. Clearly, I could not accommodate 200 people even if we had 2 days of hearings of 12 hours apiece. So, we had to try to pick a representative group, and I hope we have been fair in that selection. This clearly will not be the last hearing on this matter, and there will be time for others to testify.

Having 200 requests is high. It is not unusual. I have been through similar hearings involving Hells Canyon, French Pete, and Cascade Head—when we created the scenic research area there—and, I understand the passions, pro and con, that issues like this create.

Nevertheless, I would say that this particular one has created as much interest as any that I have been involved in.

There are no bills currently before the Senate in the sense that any have been introduced this year. I have talked with Senator Hatfield and we decided that we would wait until at least this hearing was held before we introduced anything.

Consequently, you do not need to direct your remarks to any particular bill. Whether that is the way the bill would be introduced this session or not is problematical, and would depend upon the outcome of some of the comments we hear today.

Although this hearing has to do with tourism, it is on a full Commerce Committee level. Your comments therefore, should bear some relation to tourism, feel free to range on a wider scale than that. What I want to find out from this group is what should be done with the Gorge—how should it be managed, who should manage it, what conclusions do you want to reach. What do you want the Gorge to be 25 or 50 years from now.

I suppose it's the kind of decision we perhaps should have made 25 years ago, but we did not. Sooner or later we must decide at what level of government the gorge is going to be managed—by the counties involved alone, by the States with a bistate commission, by the Federal Government in some form of designation, be it recreation area, park, scenic research area, or whatnot. There are a variety of Federal categories.

I do not come to this with any preconceived conclusion. However, I have lived in Portland all of my life—still do. I suppose I've been through the Columbia Gorge more times than I can count or remember. I've spent many, many days in Hood River—have relatives here; many days in the Dalles; and, spent many, many weekends, at least, on the Washington side of the river at Prindle, vacationing.

Last, I see one of the witnesses today is Allan Warman. I would count him as a close and good friend. I've spent many happy hours with him, sailing in his boat. As I looked out today, this is a better day than the last time we went sailing. When Allen and I went out last time it was snow, pure snow, and we sailed in the freezing weather. We went under a bridge which was lower than I thought and I tore the weathervane off of his mast. I hope he will not hold that against me in the hearings today.

With that, let's start. We will take first Shirley Eads, the director of tourism for the State of Oregon.

I might say to the witnesses, for all of you who have turned in your testimony ahead of time—and most have—I have read it all, underscored it, and have questions that I want to ask some of you. Do not feel compelled to read your entire statement verbatim and it will appear in the record as given and I think from your standpoint, and mine, and frankly from those who are listening, you would be better off to highlight the main points you want to make rather than simply reading the statement in total.

Ms. Eads.

STATEMENT OF SHIRLEY A. EADS, STATE TRAVEL DIRECTOR, OREGON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Ms. EADS. Good morning, Senator.

I want to thank you, first, for allowing me to provide testimony, and also for accommodating my other hectic time schedule today. I was one of those who did not provide written testimony. I think I was writing mine while you were reading the others. But, I have brought copies, as well as copies of some of the research reports I'll be referring to.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have copies in there?

Ms. EADS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Could we have some now?

Ms. EADS. Yes, sure.

The CHAIRMAN. Yours is one of the ones I have not seen.

Ms. EADS. Just exactly three, from the Circle K coin-operated copy machine this morning.

Let me begin by saying I think it's clear that area residents have long recognized that the Columbia Gorge is a spectacular scenic and geologic attraction, and that we ought to protect, preserve, and take care of it. And a few entrepreneurs on both sides of the river have realized they can make their livings by providing some services and facilities for visitors to the area.

But, the potential of the gorge as a major tourism resource and the economic benefits it could provide to the region I think have only recently been widely recognized at all. Even with what I think is a growing understanding that Oregon and Washington share a natural phenomenon of worldwide significance, relatively little has been done to market the gorge effectively as a tourism resource.

I would note that there are some fine visitors facilities and attractions operating now on both sides of the river, and there have been some local enthusiastic efforts to advertise the gorge to a regional audience. Right now, in the form of the Mid-Columbia Marketing Committee, I think there's the beginning of the kind of cooperative promotion effort that all of us who work in tourism applaud.

But, despite all the positive signs, attempts to gain the maximum economic benefit for the area have been restricted by several political and physical factors. First, the absence of any sustained unified effort to market the entire length of the gorge, on both sides of the river. Second, a lack of certain funding to carry out an effective marketing program. Third, a shortage of destination resort facilities and major visitor attractions.

Underlying all of these factors, of course, there's the uncertainty as to how and by whom and to what purposes the gorge ought to be managed.

Finally, and maybe most significantly, there has been no strong public or governmental commitment to developing the potential of the gorge as a tourism attraction.

Questions as to how many visitors the gorge can accommodate and how tourism can coexist with agriculture and other industries remain controversial. I hope, and I have high hope, that the beginning of these hearings signals a move toward resolving some of those issues, and that we will end up with a workable management plan for the area.

There's certainly no quick or easy solution to any of the difficulties I've listed, or if there is I don't know what it is. But, I don't think there are any insurmountable barriers, either. Regional promotion groups can and do get organized to seek results that are beneficial to all of the participants. The participants in those groups can and do agree to concentrate on what they have in common, rather than what divides them. Funding can be secured by a variety of methods, although admittedly it's harder to come by now than it was a few years ago. Similarly, destination facilities, while they're more difficult to develop than they were 10 years ago, still can be financed. Land use plans and zoning ordinances can be used both to accommodate those developments and to protect adjacent property from any serious negative impact.

I think the most important question at this point is whether the potential payoff from tourism development is worth all the effort, because it certainly is a lot of effort. That answer, of course, takes a value judgment, and I'm in no position to make that for everybody who's an interested party in this discussion.

But, our office has learned some things about the impact of the visitor industry on Oregon's economy over the past 50 years, and I hope some of that information will be useful background for those of you who have to make the hard decisions.

In 1981, nearly 12 million pleasure travelers came to Oregon from out of State. They spent nearly $1.3 billion while they were here. The preliminary results for 1982 indicate there was little change from 1981 levels.

Now, that suggests that out-of-State tourism, while it may not be recession-proof, certainly is recession-resistant. In other words, we hold our own better than most industries in tough economic times.

Our office conducts a series of interviews with tourists each summer to learn more about their specific vacation behavior in Oregon. In 1982, we learned that the average pleasure traveler stayed in Oregon just about 1 week. About one-third of those visitors used motels or hotels exclusively for lodging. About a third of them stayed in campgrounds. About 20 percent stayed with their friends and relatives. The rest used a combination.

Expenditures by all of the groups surveyed averaged $427 per party per trip. I should note a party of visitors is just about three people.

That same interview survey also showed that nearly half of the out-of-State visitors spent some of their vacation time in the Portland-Mount Hood-Columbia Gorge region. We can't identify those who chose the gorge specifically as their destination out of that region, but we do believe that getting them here isn't nearly as difficult as getting them to stay around longer; and, in general, the longer our visitors stayed, the more they spent, not only in total but per day.

Traffic counts on Interstate 84 and the Columbia River Scenic Highway indicate that on an average day, year-round, about 4,200 out-of-State visitors pass through this region. Of course, the peak periods of that traffic are concentrated in the months of June through September. Sometimes the daily counts of out-of-State tourists reach as much as 6,000 or 8,000. In-State tourist traffic is additional to that.

To increase the length of stay of visitors, we've learned in the State office that we have to do several things. First, we have to advertise; second, we have to provide very detailed travel planning information; and, third, we have to be prepared to provide a full range of services and facilities when our guests arrive.

To this point, now, I've been talking about the average visitor. That's the guy who may or may not have been reached by the State's advertising message. If we look at a survey group of visitors who did respond to a State ad, and who did receive the official state travel guide before they came to Oregon, we see a very different kind of behavior, and it demonstrates the value of an effective advertising program.

The survey program I'm referring to now has been producing pretty consistent results for 5 years, so we have some confidence that those results are good and solid.

More than half of those folks who respond to an Oregon tourism advertisement actually visit the State during the same year that they answered the ad. They stay here an average of 9 days, compared to just under 7 days for that average fellow. They spend more than $600 per party per trip, compared with $427 for the average group. A higher percentage uses the motels, hotels, guest ranches, and lodges—the upper scale commercial facilities. Fewer of them camp or stay with friends and relatives.

Maybe the most significant part of all of that is that nearly half of them tell us that this book, called "The Oregon Book," which is our official State travel guide, persuaded them to increase their length of stay here by nearly 4 days.

So, we think it's clear that you can influence visitor behavior if you market specifically to them, get them the planning literature they need; and, then, the most important part, treat them well when they do arrive.

Another important fact to keep in mind at this point is the potential for growth in tourism to this region. Our contract marketing and advertising agency has done some casting about to estimate how many people we've reached in our primary advertising markets, and they've concluded that State ads haven't even reached 50 percent of the up-scale households in California alone. That says a lot about how much more market there is out there nationwide. Beyond that, we're just beginning to dip our feet into the idea of international tourism marketing, and we know there's huge potential there.

But for the gorge, the potential, without expanding the Oregon visitor market one whit, is enormous. Right now, no more than 40 percent of our travelers come to the gorge at all. That means 60 percent of those 12 million people in 1981 could have come to visit the gorge, had they been persuaded to do so. I think they can be persuaded.

If we had the time and there weren't so many other people who had important things to say, I'd like to list dozens of ways that I think the gorge could be promoted. I'll resist that and just mention a couple.

Marketing commissionable vacation packages that travel agents and tour operators will be motivated to sell. Hosting travel writer tours, which is a very low-cost promotion method; bringing journalists in to experience the gorge, then going home and writing about it. Appearances at consumer and travel trade shows and marketplaces. Consumer and trade advertising. Direct sales calls. Foreign travel trade missions. Direct mail marketing. Just a few of the possibilities that can be explored, either by private promotion groups acting alone or in concert with the States.

I would note that both State travel offices not only work together very, very well, but are enthusiastically involved in developing private-public sector promotions.

There's plenty to do if we make the commitment to market this region, if we make the commitment to produce the materials we need, to raise the funds to pay for a sustained program, and to develop the kinds of destination facilities that will give our visitors a reason to stay here longer. But, that commitment has to come first.

Personally, I hope it does, although I can't speak for anybody but myself, because I think tourism has the greatest potential with the fewest inherent barriers and the least potential to do damage to our environment of any of our major industries.

I'd be happy to try to answer some questions if you have any, Senator.

The **Chairman**. To the best of your knowledge, how many tourist jobs are there in the gorge now?

Ms. **Eads**. In the gorge I can't tell you. We tend to look at bulk figures, on a statewide basis. But, I suspect there will be witnesses coming on who have a lot better feel for that than I do.

The **Chairman**. Do you think the number of jobs could be substantially expanded—tourist jobs—in the gorge with the proper promotion of tourism?

Ms. **Eads**. There's no question. There's no question. I think this is one of Oregon's great unmarketed attractions. It's probably unique in the world.

Let me just give you an example. We participated in a regional trade mission to the United Kingdom about 1 year ago, and we started talking about the coast, which we're so accustomed to doing because it is our No. 1 in-State attraction.

The British said, "My dear, we have coast. We're an island. What do you have that's different?" We dragged out our beautiful photo enlargements of the Columbia Gorge, and they went crazy. They loved it. They have nothing like it. They've seen nothing like it. They can't believe there's all that distance that is explorable and viewable.

So, I think the potential is just tremendous.

The **Chairman**. Could you have substantial nontourist economic expansion—business, plants—in the gorge without hurting the tourist industry?

Ms. **Eads**. I think you can, if you do it all carefully. I would be leery of a sawmill out the back door of the Hood River Inn. That seems to me not only foolish zoning, but certainly bad for potential marketing.

But, I don't see why you couldn't have other development. Certainly agriculture is incredibly compatible with tourism. In fact, they play off one another.

A large volume of requests for information we get in our office include information about where our products are grown, and where people can see them processed. They love to drive through the orchards when they're blooming, that sort of thing.

So, agriculture's certainly very compatible.

I think if you zone carefully and protect, you can do a lot of things without messing anything up.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Of course, agriculture is a heavy industry in the gorge now—a seasonal industry, but heavy. You would have some misgivings, then about a gigantic shipyard, a big sawmill plant, too many more aluminum plants?

Ms. **EADS**. I know very little about any of those specifically. I would have no misgivings about a shipping yard, for example, if it were sufficiently removed from the lodging facilities that it didn't keep people awake when they didn't want to be, and that became, in turn, a tourism attraction.

An example, I think, of where that sort of thing functions is in Coos Bay, which is working very hard right now to develop its tourism resource. They have found, after years of being embarrassed by the harbor and the ship loading and the ships, that that's about the No. 1 thing their visitors want to see, because it's something they don't have at home. I don't see why we couldn't accomplish the same thing here.

The **CHAIRMAN**. You mean that big pile of sawdust in——

Ms. **EADS**. That, yes.

The **CHAIRMAN**. That's interesting.

Ms. **EADS**. Of course, the Coos Bay folks told me yesterday they'd rather see more of it coming and going than they have been recently. But, sure, anything you don't have at home is an attraction. If you come to Oregon from Omaha, I can't think of a lot of things that would be more fun to watch than that kind of maritime activity.

The **CHAIRMAN**. I've been in Omaha.

Ms. **EADS**. Don't embarrass me by telling me they have a seaport.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Oh, no, no, it's a nice town—I'll just leave it at that. Oregon has a lot more to see than almost anyplace.

Thank you very much. I don't have any more questions.

Ms. **EADS**. Thank you, very much.

[The statement follows:]

STATEMENT OF SHIRLEY A. EADS, STATE TRAVEL DIRECTOR, OREGON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Area residents have long realized that the Columbia River Gorge is a spectacular scenic and geologic attraction that deserves special care and protection. A few entrepreneurs have recognized they could make their livings by providing services and facilities for visitors to the area. But, the potential of the Gorge as a major tourism attraction—and the economic benefits it could provide to the region—have only recently been widely recognized. Even with this growing understanding that Oregon and Washington share a natural phenomenon of world-wide importance, though, relatively little has been done to market the Gorge effectively as a tourism resource.

It must be noted that there are some fine visitor facilities and attractions available on both sides of the river; there have been some enthusiastic local efforts to advertise the Gorge to a regional audience of potential vacationers; and there is, now, in the Mid-Columbia Marketing Committee, the beginning of the kind of cooperative promotion effort that is applauded by all of us who work to attract visitors to the Pacific Northwest.

Despite all these positive signs, though, attempts to gain the maximum economic benefit for the area have been restricted by several political and physical factors: First, the absence of a sustained, unified effort to market the entire length of the Gorge, on both sides of the river; second, a lack of certain funding to carry out an effective marketing program; and third, a shortage of destination resort facilities and major visitor attractions.

Underlying all these factors, there is the uncertainty as to how, by whom, and to what purpose the Gorge ought to be managed. Finally, and probably most significantly, there has been no strong public or governmental commitment to developing the potential of the Gorge as a toursim attraction. Questions as to how many visitors the Gorge can safely accommodate, and how tourism can coexist with agriculture, remain controversial. I hope this hearing signals a move toward resolution of some of these issues, and that a workable management plan evolves.

While there is no quick and easy solutions to any of the difficulties I have listed, I don't believe there are any insurmountable barriers. Regional promotions groups can, and do, organize to seek generally beneficial results. Participants in such groups can, and do, agree to concentrate on what they have in common, rather than on what divides them.

Funding can be secured by the formation of special taxing districts to raise dedicated funds, by private and corporate contributions, government grants and loans, dues, subscriptions, special fund-raising projects, or any combination of the above.

Destination facilities, while certainly more difficult to develop than they were ten years ago, can be financed by local or outside investment, loans, grants, bond sales, or a combination of methods. Land use plans and zoning ordinances can be used both to accommodate such developments, and to protect property from serious negative impact.

Perhaps the most important question at this point is whether the potential payoff from toursim development is worth all the effort. The answer, of course, requires a value judgment. Our office has learned something about the impact of the visitor industry on Oregon's economy over the past 50 years that might provide useful background for those who must make these hard decisions.

In 1981, nearly 12 million pleasure travelers came to Oregon from out-of-state. They spent nearly 1.3 billion dollars while they were here. Preliminary results for 1982 indicate little change from 1981 levels, which suggests that out-of-state toursim, while it may not be recession-proof, certainly is recession-resistant.

Our office conducts a series of interviews with tourists each summer to learn more about their specific vacation behavior in Oregon. In 1982, we learned that the average pleasure traveler stayed in Oregon approximately one week. About one-third of them used motels/hotels exclusively for lodging; about ⅓ stayed in campgrounds; about 20 percent stayed with friends and relatives, and the rest used a combination of lodging. Expenditures by all groups surveyed averaged $427 per party, per trip.

That same interview survey also showed that nearly one-half of the out-of-state visitors spent some of their vacation time in the Portland-Mt. Hood-Columbia Gorge region. While we cannot identify those who specifically chose the Gorge as a destination, we do believe that getting them here isn't nearly as difficult as keeping them here longer. And, in general, the longer they stay, the more they spend per day.

(Traffic counts on I-84 and the Columbia River Scenic Highway indicate that, on an average, more than 4,200 out-of-state visitors pass through this region in a day. Of course, the peak periods are concentrated in the months of June through September, when the daily counts reach as high as 6,000 to 8,000.)

To increase the length of stay of our visitors, we've learned we must (1) advertise, (2) provide detailed vacation planning information, and (3) be prepared to provide a full range of services and facilities when our guests arrive.

To this point, I've been talking about the "average visitors," those who may or may not have been reached by the state's advertising messages. When we look at a survey group of visitors who responded to state ads and received the official state travel guide before coming here, we see a very different kind of behavior that demonstrates the value of an effective state advertising program. (The survey program I'm about to refer to has been producing consistent results for five years, giving us confidence the results are valid.)

More than half of those who respond to an Oregon ad actually visit the state during the same year. They stay an average of nine days (compared with nearly a week for the average traveler), and they spend more than $600 per party, per trip (compared with $427 for the average group). A higher percentage uses hotel/motels for lodging, while fewer camp or stay with friends and relatives. Perhaps most significantly, nearly half of them tell us The Oregon Book, our official state travel guide, persuaded them to extend their stay in Oregon, by an average of nearly four days. Clearly, then it is possible to influence visitor behavior by marketing and advertising.

Another important fact to keep in mind is the potential for growth of tourism to this region. Our contract marketing and advertising agency estimates that the state hasn't reached half of the upper-income households in California alone with our advertising message. Our efforts outside our adjacent states have been significantly smaller, and we have just begun to explore the potential for international tourism. The potential for the Gorge, even without expanding the current total of visitors to Oregon, is enormous. At least 60 percent of those who come to the state do not visit the Gorge, and they could be persuaded to do so.

If time permitted, we could list dozens of promotion programs and advertising methods this region could use to increase the tourism industry. Marketing commissionable vacation packages through travel agents and tour operators, hosting travel writer tours, appearance at consumer and travel trade shows and marketplaces, consumer and trade advertising, sales calls, foreign travel trade missions, and direct mail marketing are just a few of the possibilities that can be explored, either by private promotion groups working alone or in concert with the states.

There's plenty to do, if we make the commitment to market this region, produce the necessary materials, raise funds to pay for a program, and develop more destination facilities. But, the commitment must come first. I hope it does, because I believe tourism has the greatest potential, with the fewest inherent barriers, and the least potential damage to the environment, of any of our major industries.

The CHAIRMAN. Next we'll take Mr. Jeffrey Breckel, executive director of the Oregon Columbia Gorge Commission and the Washington Columbia Gorge Commission.

Could I ask the witnesses, if they have not given us their statements could they turn them in now so we can have a chance to look at them? We're only missing three or four. But, if you could collect them from the witnesses who haven't given them to us, I'd appreciate it.

Go right ahead, Mr. Breckel.

STATEMENT OF JEFFREY BRECKEL, DIRECTOR, OREGON COLUMBIA GORGE COMMISSION, AND WASHINGTON COLUMBIA GORGE COMMISSION

Mr. BRECKEL. Good morning, Senator.

As can be seen by even the most casual visitor to the 84-mile Columbia River Gorge, that gorge offers a spectacular and diverse array of scenic natural and cultural wonders. From the lush and dense forestlands of the West, to the barren scablands of the East; from the river to the towering peaks; from the milltowns to the orchards; man's activities have melded with the natural values of the gorge over the past 11,000 years to create a landscape of national distinction.

Since their inception, it has the been the mission of the Oregon and Washington Gorge Commissions, as advisory bodies, to preserve, protect, and enhance the unique scenic natural and cultural values of the region.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Breckel, let me stop you for just a moment. Let me say again to the witnesses we will not get through this hearing if everybody reads his statement in its entirety. Some of them are very, very long. I mean, if read, they're 30 or 40 minutes long in the reading.

I'm going to have to ask you, if you've got a full statement it will be in the record, but let's just take as a given that the gorge is unique and beautiful. I don't think there's anybody here, pro or con, who's going to argue that subject. But, I would appreciate it if you can emphasize your main points without reading your statement in its entirety.

Mr. **Breckel**. Thank you. Yes; our statement that you have there is considerably longer than the statement I intend to make, Senator.

In carrying out our mission of stewardship of the gorge over the past years, the commissions have come to recognize that man's activities have played an important role in the gorge, and will continue to do so; and, that such activities have, in fact, contributed in many instances to the special character of this region.

Yet, if we are to retain this special character, an equitable balance between economic development and environmental protection must be achieved and maintained. The scenic qualities of the gorge must be recognized for what they are: the region's most notable and valuable natural resource and economic asset. Ill-conceived or poorly planned development can needlessly and permanently reduce or destroy these values and the economic and social benefits they generate.

It is undeniably difficult to place a fixed value on scenic and natural values. They cannot be measured, bought, sold—by the ton, board foot, or by the bushel. Yet they are not without value, both tangible and intangible.

Recent emphasis on tourism is directed at tapping these resources. As Shirley Eads noted, those efforts are yet in their infancy in the gorge, and this area is just now really beginning to recognize its tourism potential, and to pursue its utilization.

Certainly that's demonstrated most recently by the Port of Cascade locks in Hood River County through its construction of the tourboat sternwheeler replica; by a major resort complex being contemplated for the city of North Bonneville in Skamania County. These ventures will generate a direct economic return to the area, as well as various indirect spinoffs.

But, setting aside these potential direct returns, we must also consider the more intangible returns: the contribution of natural and scenic values to the quality of life that have been attributed to the Pacific Northwest. As important as good will to any successful business, a quality of life is essential to attracting and sustaining new business activity. Certainly, the gorge makes a substantial contribution in this area, not only to the local communities, but to the Portland and Vancouver metropolitan area. If we are to continue to derive these benefits of the region's scenic and natural values, we must insure the protection and prudent use of these resources.

It is in achieving this protection, however, that difficulties arise. Regardless of whose growth projections you choose to accept, increased development pressures are emerging in the gorge, and will continue to intensify. The degree of development pressures makes little difference when one considers the ultimate outcome. Once initiated, ill-conceived or poorly planned land use or resource management patterns are difficult, if not impossible, to mitigate. Further, with nearly 50 agencies involved in land use regulation and resource management in the gorge, the capability to effectively deal with these issues on a regional basis has historically been practically nil.

In recognition of the emerging and the historical management difficulties in the gorge, we believe that effective long-term management of the area must encompass several points.

First, it must be singular in nature, transcending State and county boundaries. It must have the authority and the resources necessary to deal with a wide range of management issues. It must provide for the full and equal participation of local, State, and Federal interests. We do not feel that any one level of government should dominate management of the regions' resources.

It must provide for the protection and enhancement of scenic and natural values, as well as the continuing viability of gorge communities and compatible economic pursuits.

It must protect the interests of the public, as well as those of the gorge residents and landowners, by carefully tailoring conservation strategies to the values needing protection.

Such management should not jeopardize economic activity. It may result in such activity being redirected in the future to take better advantage of the region's unique values. But, traditional economic pursuits need not be precluded.

Transportation and agricultural uses of the gorge, for instance, are generally compatible with scenic and natural values. Other activities, such as forestry, surface mining, and residential development can also be accommodated if they are carefully planned and located.

Outside of the Dallesport Peninsula in Klickitat County, we already find that most of the commercial and industrial development is limited and confined to existing incorporated towns.

It is in pursuing this level of protection, however, that the commissions have found to date that many of the management proposals that have come up have fallen considerably short of addressing our concerns or satisfying our criteria.

I think, Senator, that that extends to the Federal proposals that were considered during the last session of Congress. We do not feel that either of these bills established that full and equal partnership that we feel is essential to effective long term and lasting management of this area.

We also feel that acquisition and the issue of acquisition, which has generated so much debate, was poorly handled. In some instances too much emphasis was placed on acquisition. Arbitrary limits were placed on acquisition without really good knowledge of what resources we were trying to protect, what was threatening them, and what the immediacy of those threats were.

We would like to see acquisition placed in its proper perspective. Certainly, it is an important conservation tool. However, we would also like to see more emphasis on the less severe and possibly equally effective conservation techniques such as less-than-fee acquisition, other incentives or subsidies that State and local governments can provide, and effective land use planning.

In closing, the commissions believe that the scenic and natural values of the gorge are important resource and economic assets. We believe that immediate progress toward singular management of the region is essential to insure both long-term protection and compatible utilization of its resources. We believe that such management should provide for the full and equal participation of all levels of government.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you a question.

You are the principal paid executive of both commissions is that correct?

Mr. BRECKEL. Yes, sir, that's correct.

The CHAIRMAN. You're one of the few witnesses who literally has a foot in both Oregon and Washington.

Mr. BRECKEL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Does Washington have laws similar to the Land Conservation and Development Commission law in Oregon?

Mr. BRECKEL. No, they do not. Responsibility for State land use planning in Washington has largely been delegated to the municipalities and the counties. There is no statewide direction or statewide policy setting priorities for land use planning within the State of Washington.

So, there is a considerably different framework for land use protection in the States.

The CHAIRMAN. So, the counties in Washington are pretty much free to do as they wish with the land under their jurisdiction, and there is no State authority holding them to some kind of statewide or gorge-length uniform planning goal?

Mr. BRECKEL. Yes, sir, that is true.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, as far as the counties on the Washington-side are concerned—Clark, Skamania, and Klickitat—is there any common planning thread among them?

Mr. BRECKEL. Until recently, I would say no. I understand the counties now have signed some sort of an interlocal agreement to engage in some form of regional planning. I think you'll probably receive testimony on that later today. I'm not sure of the extent of that agreement, or how binding it is on any of those parties.

But, no, outside of the gorge commissions' attempts to encourage a regional approach to management, there has been no active program on it.

The CHAIRMAN. And if the Washington counties have anything that's uniform, or at least concerted, it's relatively recent?

Mr. BRECKEL. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, you indicate you think it is imperative that there be a single gorge management?

Mr. BRECKEL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You feel that we cannot have two or three counties on each side of the river, each with their own planning units, and two States, and the U.S. Forest Service acting independently; that there has to be one planning agency, without dominance by any particular government, Federal, State, or local.

Give me some idea of how such a governing body should be structured so that you don't end up with a check-and-balance system that's all check and no action. Who should serve on it? How many people?

Mr. BRECKEL. Well, when you get right down to the mechanics, I think what we would prefer would be to see a citizens' regional commission, with appointments from all three levels of government; rather than, for example, having direct agency representation on that body.

I think the reason for that is when we start having direct agency or bureaucrat representation on any regional panel, we end up with an individual that fills the position temporarily, and then goes back to his agency to work. When he comes to that regional panel, he brings the objectives, charter, desires or the legal requirements of his particular agency or constituency.

We would like to see a citizens' body, a more impartial body, setting those standards, and then the bureaucrats implementing those standards.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you give any weight to population? Should Clark or Multnomah County get more representation, than Hood River County or Skamania County?

Mr. BRECKEL. Well, I don't think the basis should be made on population. You could not base it on population and come up with representation for all three levels of government.

Certainly, I think the local governments deserve equal representation among themselves on that board. Certainly you want to keep it down to manageable size. That may require limiting representation from each local government.

But, I don't think you can make that allocation on the basis of population.

The CHAIRMAN. I'm trying to compare this situation with the other two areas I'm familiar with—again, Hells Canyon and Cascade Head. In Hells Canyon there is no citizens' committee. The Forest Service does all the planning, although they are directed to consult with the local governments. There are some differences of opinion, although, interestingly, the differences are not between Portland and Wallowa County, for instance. The differences are within the adjacent counties over questions such as whether whitewater rafters ought to have preference over jetboaters. It's a very local argument.

But the planning process seems to have worked with no commission.

Mr. BRECKEL. Well, I think the gorge is a unique area in terms of its existing land ownership, and land use patterns. By virtue of the fact there are over 40,000 people living within the gorge, we have established communities. Giving representation to those various interests that are here now, and recognizing that they all have a valid interest and concern in the outcome of future management of this area, will provide the most lasting and effective relationship for managing the area's resources. Certainly the technical expertise in the management agencies in place now should be utilized. They should be involved. But, I think when it comes down to setting those priorities, I think it might be better to rely on a regional commission of a more balanced perspective.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you if you've found the same thing I have in dealing with these other areas where we have set up some kind of Federal management. I find a certain sense by the people living closest to the area that how it is managed is not the business of those who live further away, even though they may live in the same State.

Mr. **Breckel**. I think that's a fairly common observation. I've seen that in many counties, many areas of the States, many areas on the east coast, when we start talking about any regulation that has to do with the utilization of an individual's private property, or what he considers his private property. Certainly I think that's a fair observation, particularly within the gorge, that some people who live and own property here feel that they have an exclusive right to use their property in the manner they feel is most appropriate in their own personal view.

But, I think that we also have to recognize here that we have to establish a good neighbor policy. We have to recognize the interests of the other groups. Certainly if you're going to live in the Columbia River gorge, I think you have to recognize that there is an interest—and certainly a valid interest—in those people outside the gorge who use the area. I think that's demonstrated through the commitment and investment of the States and Federal governments in providing recreation facilities and in providing hydroelectric facilities for producing electricity which is used largely outside of the area.

So, I think that with land ownership not only comes the rights of landownership, but the responsibility of assuring that that land is used in a way that is sensitive to the needs of society in general.

The **Chairman**. What you're telling me is that we have to strike a balance between those who like to use the area for recreation and those who live in it, and that it must be managed by a single commission which no group can dominate and no group can veto.

Mr. **Breckel**. And I've heard a lot of people strike out for the balance, but what I've observed, sir, is that one man's balance is often another man's extreme. I don't think we've quite reached that point, but the potential is there. A fair and equitable solution to this problem is needed, and there must be a concerted effort to reach that solution in the near term. I don't think it's fair to any of the parties involved, nor do I think it's fair to the gorge on a day-to-day basis, to prolong this decision. It should be made so we can get about the business of either taking care of the gorge or letting it go on as it has.

The **Chairman**. You're almost calling for a Solomon-like decision as to how to create this commission, a decision that will make everyone comfortable and happy, and at the same time will prevent any one group from dominating.

Mr. **Breckel**. Well, I think that maybe you won't make everyone happy, but you may certainly make everyone equally unhappy.

The **Chairman**. Well, it won't be the first time I've done that, I guess.

I have no other questions. Thank you very much, I appreciate it.

[The statement follows:]

STATEMENT OF THE OREGON AND WASHINGTON COLUMBIA RIVER GORGE COMMISSIONS

Mr. Chairman and Subcommittee Members, as can be seen by even the most casual visitor, the 84-mile Columbia River Gorge offers a spectacular and diverse array of scenic, natural and cultural wonders. From the lush dense forestlands of the west to the barren scablands of the east, from the river to towering peaks, from mill towns to orchards, man's activities have melded with natural values over the past 11,000 years to create a landscape of national distinction.

Since their inception, it has been the mission of the Oregon and Washington Columbia River Gorge Commissions as advisory bodies to preserve, protect and enhance the unique scenic, natural and cultural values of the region, and to ensure that these values will be maintained for public enjoyment, recreation, education, and scientific study. In attempting to carry out this mission over the years, the Commissions have come to recognize that man's activities have played, and will continue to play, an important role in the history of the Gorge. Such activities in many instances have contributed to the special character of the region.

Yet, if we are to retain this special character, an equitable balance between economic development and environmental protection must be achieved and maintained. The scenic and natural qualities of the Gorge must be recognized for what they are: The region's most notable and valuable natural resource and economic asset. Ill-conceived or poorly-planned development can needlessly, and permanently, reduce or destroy these values and the economic and social benefits they generate.

It is undeniably difficult to place a fixed value on scenic and natural qualities. They cannot be measured, bought or sold by the ton, board feet or bushel. Yet, they are not without value, both tangible and intangible. Recent emphasis on tourism is directed at tapping these resources. Most recently, the Fort of Cascade Locks in Hood River County is constructing a larger tourboat, a stern-wheeler replica. A major resort complex is being contemplated for the City of North Bonneville in Skamania County. If successful, these ventures will result in a direct economic gain, as well as a variety of indirect spinoffs.

Setting aside these potential returns, we must also consider the more intangible returns: The contribution of scenic and natural values to the "quality of life" attributed to the Pacific Northwest. As important as goodwill to any successful business, a high "quality of life" is essential to attracting new and sustaining economic activity. Certainly, the Gorge makes a substantial contribution in this area not only to local communities, but also the Portland/Vancouver metropolitan area.

If we are to derive these benefits of the region's scenic and natural values, we must ensure the protection and prudent use of its resources. It is in achieving such protection, however, that difficulties arise. Regardless of whose growth projections you choose to accept, increased development pressures are emerging and will continue to intensify. The degree of development pressures makes little difference when one considers the ultimate and cumulative impacts. Once initiated, ill-conceived or poorly-planned land use or resource management patterns are difficult, or not nearly impossible, to mitigate. Further, with nearly 50 agencies involved in land use regulation or resource management in the Gorge, the capability to effectively handle development pressures and planning on a regional basis has historically been practically nil.

In recognition of these emerging and historical management difficulties, the Gorge Commissions believe that effective long-term management must:

1. Be singular in nature, transcending state and county boundaries.
2. Have the authority and resources to deal effectively with a wide range of management issues.
3. Provide for the full and equal participation of local, state and federal interests. No one level of government should dominate management of the region's resources.
4. Provide for the protection and enhancement of scenic and natural values, as well as the continuing viability of Gorge Communities and compatible economic pursuits.
5. Protect the interests of the public, as well as Gorge residents and landowners by carefully tailoring conservation strategies to the values needing protection.

Such management should not jeopardize economic activity. It may result in such activity being redirected in the future to take better advantage of the region's unique values, but traditional economic pursuits need not be precluded. Transportation and agricultural uses of the Gorge, for instance, are generally compatible with scenic and natural values. Other activities, such as forestry, surface mining and residential development, can also be accommodated if they are carefully planned and located. Outside of the Dallesport peninsula in Klickitat County, commercial and industrial development is already largely confined to existing incorporated towns.

In pursuing an effective level of protection for the Gorge, the Commissions have conscientiously and thoroughly reviewed all management proposals. To date, however, we have yet to find any proposal which adequately satisfied our criteria and addresses our concerns.

With regard to legislation introduced during the last session of Congress, the Commissions support the single management concept proposed. And, while the Commissions support immediate progress toward establishing single management of the region, we feel that serious additional consideration must be given to several key elements of the bills prior to any reintroduction during this session of Congress. To facilitate in the discussion of these elements, we have, for the purpose of this testimony, adopted the widespread practice of referring to S. 2318, H.R. 6002 and H.R. 6026 as the "Packwood bill," and to S. 2319 and H.R. 6001 as the "Wyden bill."

Section 2(b)(4) of both the Packwood and Wyden bills indicate that one of the purposes of the acts would be "to protect and perpetuate the existing economy of the Columbia River Gorge." The Packwood bill, however, limits itself to recognition of "historic economic pursuits, such as farming, grazing, forestry and orcharding." While the Wyden bill recognizes any "compatible economic pursuits outside the communities as an appropriate part of the gorge character," we feel the Packwood bill is unnecessarily restrictive in its limited listing of historic economic pursuits. The position set forth in the Wyden bill that any economic pursuit must be compatible with scenic and natural values should afford the necessary protection without unduly restricting economic activity.

Section 2(b)(7) of both bills state that another purpose of the acts would be "to facilitate and effectuate a partnership among the Federal Government, the State of Oregon, the State of Washington and local government entities located within the Columbia River Gorge." As previously noted, the Commissions believe that such a partnership is the key element to the success of any management proposal. Yet, we feel that both the Packwood and Wyden bills fail to provide for the establishment of an effective partnership.

Sections 4, 5, 6, 9, 10 and 12 of the Packwood bill clearly vest the Secretary of Agriculture with nearly exclusive authority in planning and management of the area. The Regional Commission, proposed in Section 4(b) of the Packwood bill, while fairly representing local, state and federal interests, would relegate local and state governments to largely an advisory role.

The Wyden bill, while substantially increasing the role of a Regional Commission, would also vest the Secretary of Agriculture with disproportionate authority. More significantly however, the composition of the Regional Commission proposed in the Wyden bill would not provide for the full and equal participation of federal interests.

In summary, the Commissions believe that the primary or ultimate authority for planning and administration of the Gorge should be vested in the Regional Commission and not the Secretary of Agriculture and the U.S. Forest Service. Further, the Regional Commission should provide for the full participation of local, state and federal interests with no single level of government in a dominant role. The Forest Service should serve only as a facilitator and coordinator in carrying out the policies and directives of the Commission. The Secretary of Agriculture should only be able to usurp the authority of the Regional Commission if the Commission fails to act in accordance with the provisions of the act.

Section 4(b)(10) of the Packwood bill specifies that the Secretary of Agriculture shall provide the Regional Commission with staff and technical assistance he considers appropriate. Section 3(i) of the Wyden bill would enable the Regional Commission to retain its own staff. We support the staff position of the Wyden bill. By utilizing a separate and independent staff, a more balanced and credible perspective could be achieved in planning and coordinating management. This is not to say that technical assistance from the Forest Service or state and local agencies would not be desirable. Staffing should, however, be under the direct control of the Regional Commission.

In general, the Commissions support the content requirements for the management plan as specified in Section 5 of the Packwood bill and Section 6 of the Wyden bill. We feel, however, that provisions must be made for the establishment and review of growth boundaries around unincorporated communities, in a manner similar to that proposed for incorporated cities and towns. We particularly agree with the provision in the Packwood bill requiring procedures for the periodic review of lands designated critical.

Section 6 of the Packwood bill and Section 5 of the Wyden bill would establish a moratorium on new uses in critical areas. Under the Packwood bill the moratorium would remain in effect pending adoption of interim management guidelines. Under the Wyden bill, the moratorium would be in effect until the final management plan is adopted. We feel that the moratorium should be in effect until interim management guidelines are adopted and implemented by the Regional Commission. We agree with the provision in the Wyden bill which would enable the Regional Commission to grant an exception to the moratorium if a proposed use was found to be consistent with the purposes of the act.

The Commissions support the general enforcement provisions contained in Section 9 of the Packwood bill with one exception. We feel that enforcement authority should pass to the Regional Commission, not the Secretary of Agriculture, should a local government fail to accept or exercise such responsibility within its jurisdiction. Only if the Regional Commission fails to enforce the provisions of the act or the management plan should the Secretary of Agriculture intercede.

Acquisition of land, particularly through condemnation, as discussed in Section 8 of the Wyden bill and Section 12 of the Packwood bill, has provoked considerable debate. While acquisition of land in fee and less-than-fee is a valuable and necessary conservation aid, it should be limited to instances where no other technique, such as land use controls, subsidies or incentives, is practical. Unless title is required for subsequent public development or use, less-than-fee acquisitions, such as scenic easements and development rights, should generally be given priority over fee title acquisition.

The Packwood bill places too much emphasis on acquisition and fails to adequately address or rank the use of other conservation techniques which could be equally effective but far less severe. Section 12(a)(4)(A) of the Packwood bill would prohibit acquisition of more than 10 per cent of the total scenic area acreage by condemnation. This 10 percent translates to approximately 32,000 acres, and represents, in our opinion, an arbitrary and likely excessive amount. Condemnation should be used only as a last resort when other protection or conservation techniques are demonstrated to be infeasible. The Wyden bill is probably overly restrictive in providing for acquisition by not recognizing the need to acquire lands for public recreation and use.

In keeping with our previous comments regarding the responsibilities of the Regional Commission, we believe all acquisition actions should be approved by the Commission. Under no circumstances should condemnation be initiated without prior Regional Commission approval. Consideration should also be given to expanding the exemptions to condemnation specified in Section 12(a)(2) of the Packwood bill by including forestry along with single family residences, farming and grazing. This section of the bill should also be more specific in defining what would constitute a substantial change in use, thereby allowing acquisition by condemnation. Finally, initial appropriation to the acquisition fund should not be so large as to encourage the use of acquisition without thorough evaluation and utilization of other conservation techniques which may be equally effective but less severe.

Section 16 of the Packwood bill and Section 14 of the Wyden bill cover mitigation of local revenue losses. The bill would allow the Secretary to make payments to a local government to mitigate loss of property tax revenue, if the secretary determines that acquisition of any real property would substantially increase the tax burden on remaining private properties. It is likely, in our opinion, that the acquisition of a single parcel will in most cases not have a significant impact on tax revenues. Yet when the cumulative impacts of numerous small acquisitions are totaled, the impact may be quite significant. Accordingly, payments in lieu of taxes should be made for every parcel acquired. Further, these payments should directly offset the amount of lost revenue and continue indefinitely.

In closing, the Commissions believe that the scenic and natural values of the Gorge are an important resource and economic asset. We believe that immediate progress toward singular management of the region is essential to ensure both long-term protection and compatible utilization of scenic and natural resources. We believe that such management should provide for the full and equal participation of all levels of government.

Thank you for this opportunity to offer our observations and comments.

The CHAIRMAN. Next, we'll take Mr. Charles Luce, well known in this area as the former Bonneville Power Administrator, and well known in the East as the long-time president of the Consolidated Edison Co.

Mr. Luce, I would have to wager that no matter how difficult this problem may be, it may not seem as difficult as some of the ones you've faced in your last capacity, in a principal executive position.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES LUCE

Mr. LUCE. I think I would agree with you, Senator. We do a lot of balancing in New York that's not easy at times.

I appreciate appearing before your hearing this morning and in support of, generally, the position of The Friends of the Columbia Gorge, of which I am a member and one of the directors.

You commented that we don't need to spend a great deal of time emphasizing the beauty of the Columbia Gorge. It is world class, and must be preserved not only for environmental and aesthetic reasons, but I think for economic reasons.

Tourism has been discussed. I think if the gorge were made a Federal scenic area, that it would inevitably encourage tourism, because it would give national billing to what is, indeed, a national treasure, but which isn't really all that well known in the East, perhaps even in the Midwest.

The last 15 years I've lived very near the Hudson River and, indeed, had some power plants on the Hudson River, and tried to build one on the Hudson River that I wasn't allowed to. The Hudson River, which is deemed as a treasure by the people of New York and the New York metropolitan area, doesn't begin to have the beauties of the Columbia River. Yet far more attention is paid to preserving the Hudson River than our Columbia River.

The CHAIRMAN. I might say that having lived in the East with Congress meeting 10 months a year, that the things they will go out of their way to preserve at best don't match 100 things we pay no attention to here. The one that strikes me most around Washington is the 200-mile-long C&O Towpath which has become a national park. It's an old barge canal that basically is a muddy little ditch with an asphalt track along one side that joggers and bicyclists use. This is a national park.

I understand the historic importance of it, but if you mean beauty, it bears a certain resemblance to the Columbia Slough.

Mr. LUCE. I think the Columbia Slough may be a little more attractive. I've walked along that canal many times when I lived back in the Washington area.

I think, also, that another economic advantage of protecting this marvelous scenic asset that we have goes not just to tourism, but to the future economy of our Pacific Northwest—Oregon and Washington. I think we're in a transitional period in our economy out here. The very low power rates that we had for years, years when I was Bonneville Administrator—they were two mills a kilowatt hour—have increased dramatically; and, I think they're going to increase even further as we move from an all-hydro system to a hydro and a much more expensive steam system.

Therefore, some of the basic industries that we relied on for growth in the Northwest aren't going to find the same economic attraction. So, we're going to have to look elsewhere for the economic growth. I think it's going to come from light industry, from high technology, if you will. But, in our competition with other States for high technology, we're up against some very tough competition. The silicon valleys of the Boston area, of the San Francisco Bay area, and many, many other States are emphasizing their attractiveness for that type of industry.

We have assets out here that Illinois can't offer, or that Massachusetts can't offer in the Boston area, or I would say even the Bay Area in California. We have a marvelous place to live, and the Columbia River and the Columbia River Gorge is the crown jewel of it all.

So, I think that if we're going to persuade companies to come out here, we want to be able to show them that this is a great place for employees to live so that employees will be attracted to come out here, the people they're looking for in these high tech industries.

I think, therefore, that that's another reason to protect this great asset, the Columbia Gorge.

I know there's a great deal of concern about protection of property rights in the gorge, and there should be concern about that. We always ran into that when we were extending the national parks during the period that I was in the Interior Department, both at Bonneville and as Under Secretary.

I think, though, that ways can be found to provide reasonable protection to the people who own property, first of all, through strong local representation on the commission that does the basic comprehensive planning for preservation of the gorge who are, of course, going to take into account the rights of the people who own property there.

We also used in the Interior Department in the days when I was there something called a scenic easement, where if property were designated or classified for scenic purposes, but that's all that the Government expected of the land, people could be left in possession, could enjoy it, but would be paid for any loss of value in the land that might occur because otherwise it would be commercially developed.

I don't know that there is a great deal of that kind of land in the Columbia Gorge. There might be some. I think that device could be used here, as well as it has been in the past. I think over in the Sawtooth Recreational Area, also, that device has been used.

So, I think that the balance that the previous speaker spoke of can be achieved and can be achieved with fairness, and that we can preserve this great asset.

I do think as far as management of it is concerned that you really have to have somebody who has the last say. As I heard you comment earlier, you can't have so many checks and balances that it's all check and no action or decision.

I would think that the Secretary of Agriculture, for example, who administers the Sawtooth Recreational Area, and I believe the one in Hells Canyon, as well, would pay very close attention to whatever a local commission would recommend in the way of a plan. I can't imagine him just overriding it. After all, he has to get along with the senators from the State, with the congressmen from the State. He wants to get along with the local people. He knows they have the best knowledge of the situation.

At the same time, though, you have to have somebody who finally can say this is the way we're going to do it. Your local commission can have divisions of opinion among themselves. Somebody has to settle them.

So, I think if we're going to get the Federal Government involved in this thing, that the Secretary should finally have the last say. Hopefully, he'd never have to use it.

There's another reason for that, I think, and that is to the extent that financing is going to be needed, and there'll be some money needed for the proposed recreational area, given the state of finances of our two States, I think probably it's going to be mostly Federal aid, Federal money; and, if you have Federal money, you really have to have some kind of general Federal oversight.

I'm an exbureaucrat, so I really don't fear these bureaucrats as much as the previous speaker. I think it's possible to bring Government close to the people, and that it could be done in this situation.

The CHAIRMAN. Again, my experience with both Cascade Head and Hells Canyon—both under Forest Service administration but with slightly different designations, one a recreation area and one a scenic research area—is that once the battle was over on the creation, the subsequent battles are not Portland versus Joseph, they're battles within the area, among the local people. Again, the one I've seen the most is the argument between those who are involved in jetboating versus those who are involved in floating. Yet they're both indigenous industries with local people running them.

Somebody has to make a decision as to whether the jetboaters can be there 5 days a week or 3 days a week. From my experience with the Forest Service I think we in Oregon are lucky that most of the significant people in the Forest Service have spent a fair amount of time in Oregon before going back to Washington. Most of them have been chiefs of one or another of our major forests in Oregon. Many of them were raised here. They have a very good feeling for this area. If I had to pick a lead agency, a Federal agency, that I would feel most comfortable with, it would be the Forest Service.

They own a fair portion of the land on the Oregon side now. These are not foreigners and strangers to our shore. Most of them have lived here a fair portion of their lives.

Thank you, Chuck. I have no other questions.

Mr. LUCE. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, we'll go on with our first panel. Allan Warman of the Mid-Columbia Economic Development District; Steve Lindstrom, Pacific Northwest Waterways; and Howard Burnett, Union Pacific Railroad.

We'll take the witnesses in the order they appeared on the list. So, Allan, we'll start with you. I never did ask you, did you get the new wind indicator on your boat?

STATEMENT OF ALLAN WARMAN, MID-COLUMBIA ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

Mr. WARMAN. Sure.

The CHAIRMAN. You didn't tell me the bridge was that low.

Mr. WARMAN. You didn't ask me if it was that high.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

Mr. WARMAN. Senator, thank you very much for the opportunity to testify. Again, I am Al Warman, I'm representing the Mid-Columbia Economic Development District. This is a five-county organization in both States—Wasco, Sherman, and Hood River in Oregon; Klickitat and Skamania in Washington.

I understand really the intent of this hearing is to determine the potential for economic development and tourism in the Columbia Gorge and what the impacts may be in regard to the national scenic area designation.

With my comments, I reference last year's proposed legislation as a guideline because it provides some framework to work with.

The district's board of directors is concerned about this legislation, and it feels the legislation will affect the region's economy, the economic structure, individual businesses, composition of the labor force, and housing.

These changes presently are unpredictable and not measurable. There is no Columbia Gorge-specific economic documentation available on these inevitable changes.

Also, it's been brought to our attention that this legislation may impact not only our economy but those economies further upstream. It's felt that this legislation, or the proposed legislation could prevent any opportunity to do other developments—for example, the Bonneville lock expansion.

It, therefore, seems prudent that documentation and an understanding of the impacts of this legislation be prepared prior to any disruption of the local economies. The district recommends that perhaps an economic impact statement be completed before submitting this legislation to Congress.

The region's historical and present economy depends upon resource extraction industries, agriculture and forestry. These industries presently exhibit very cyclical employment and produce for the local residents an unstable labor force. Diversification, by encouraging tourism and industrial development, is necessary. Both industries require a substantial investment of land and financial resources to again reach our goal of increased job opportunities and stabilization.

Industrial development has been, as most of us are aware, increasing in the Columbia River Gorge and it's securing a haven for our economic stability. This development is composed of light industrial facilities recently, which could be explained through what's been here—ethanol production plants, outdoor manufacturing, textile assembly plants, fish processing, high density foam insulation manufacturers, electronic assembly businesses, secondary technical wood processing plants, and many others. This list exhibits its diversity, which we need, and these firms each employ from 5 to 100 people—no major dependence on one. Light and medium industrialization of this type is compatible and is the intent of local economic developers.

Still, it must be kept in mind that the area is still experiencing cyclical unemployment due to the fact that we are dependent upon our major industries of agriculture and forestry.

Many years of appreciating the geological features of the mid-Columbia region have compelled people to wish that the tourism business will become a major economic reality in the area. It is proposed, again in the last year's legislation, that the Columbia Gorge competitive advantage lies in the realization of this industry—tourism.

As an overview of tourism, there are many potentials and problems in its development. Tourism cycles with the seasons, activities, and regional demand changes, exhibiting the same type of cycles already present in our basic industries.

There are a number of reasons why a plan or a review of what is present now should be prepared for the realization of tourism benefits. This plan should include, first, interdependence. Tourism is really a consumer-travel concept rather than a supplier-seller concept. Lodging facilities cannot be successfully developed unless there are reasons for people to come here in the first place.

But, for the most part, these reasons-for-coming attractions are provided by other entities other than that lodging supplier, thus leading to the chicken or egg problem in trying to determine an adequate market.

Second, community harmony. If no direction is provided, less desirable development may take place in the tourism industry. This can lead to the kind of tourism that has negative effects to significant sectors of the community.

One problem that can develop as tourism increases is the congestion in streets and highways, et cetera. When considered in advance, these problems can be avoided.

Third, sound growth. Many of the new and expanding businesses serving travelers will be small retail and service firms. Typically, these businesses have a high incident of failure in the initial years due to their resource limitations and acquiring market information.

Fourth, community acceptance. A design of a comprehensive plan and understanding of what the statistics or the information is if this legislation becomes law, will involve a broad spectrum of people. The opportunity for input into the direction of tourism will help avoid later conflicts and problems for this community support as impact of tourism growth is felt.

Fifth, resource allocation. Funds, as Shirley Eads mentioned, and others, funds could be available if you have an understanding of how the success of the tourism industry could be. If you have these analyses and forecasts, the investment people are more willing to go along with you.

Tourism and industrial development are necessary for the stabilization of our economy; therefore, the district feels that these directions should not be totally relied upon, nor eliminated.

Summarized, the legislation, I feel—and the district—will affect the region's economy, bringing a choice between the preservation of natural habitat and the preservation of local residents' jobs. A delicate balance exists, and if this legislation does go through without the precise documentation and determinations of what the economic future could be, this balance is displaced. We question whether this is in the best interests of the folks here.

Thank you very much.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Allan, you stressed local control. Do the people in Olympia or Vancouver have any right in this local control or should they have any? How should they be represented?

Mr. **WARMAN**. From an economic standpoint, they are a tourist. They're coming to the area to enjoy the resources here. I suspect that they would have some sort of need—this is coming from their point of view—that they would want a voice in how the gorge goes.

I think, of course, as they do come here they impact the locals more severely than they understand. Whether you're asking me to say their voice should be louder than the locals, I can't make a statement of that type. I think local control, of course, local understanding of the economic situation is paramount.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any idea how many people are involved in tourism in the gorge in terms of jobs?

Mr. WARMAN. As I stated, there's really very little adequate information. The State of Oregon's statistics take in the gorge, and they also take in Portland. You can't discriminate between who's where, and how.

The information that's derived at the tourism counting places, at, say, Multnomah Falls, is on a car basis. Well, I've stopped there several times to cross the highway and I wasn't a tourist, of course.

So, you know, these statistics aren't based on tourism, they're based on traffic flow.

The CHAIRMAN. It's frustrating, because Shirley Eads wasn't sure that she could break it down either. When you ask the question can jobs and tourism be increased, can it be an economic base, you need to start with some statistical base. You have to know what the base is, and whether or not you can increase it. You and I have talked about this privately, and I've talked with others, and nobody can seem to give me a handle on how many jobs are involved at the moment, let alone how many could be.

Mr. WARMAN. I think, not to hit the job issue, but in terms of the economic multiplier, that is, you have someone coming in here and he spends $1, whether he's a tourist or a businessman, if it's an overall economic combination of resources, this multiplier for the mid-Columbia area is about 2.4 to 2.6 for indirect benefits. I spend $1 and that dollar turns into $2.40.

I have some old statistics, and they are representative of the mid-Columbia area, and they deal primarily with tourism. It's approximately half—1.27 to 1.35. It's a significantly less effect for tourism.

This is due to cyclical jobs and low wages, and some other impacts.

The CHAIRMAN. That's all the questions I have for you Allen. Let me say, before Mr. Lindstrom testifies, speaking on Senator Hatfield's and my behalf, we have no intention in this legislation of in any way affecting the building of a new lock at Bonneville. He has introduced the legislation, I'm a cosponsor of it, and we have no intention, overtly or covertly, to in any way jeopardize that by any gorge legislation we may pass. I want to set everybody's mind at ease on that, if I can.

[The statement follows:]

STATEMENT OF ALLAN WARMAN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, MID-COLUMBIA ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

Senator Packwood, the Board of Directors of the Mid-Columbia Economic Development District (MCEDD) are concerned about the proposed Columbia River Gorge Legislation from the aspect of what the Legislation's economic effect will be to the region. The District feels that the legislation will affects the region's economies—the economic structure, individual businesses, the composition of the labor force and housing-producing broad reaching economic impacts. These changes are presently unpredictable and not measurable yet their magnitude and results will occur. Just as legislation or development could affect the environmental balance an environmental impact sttement is prepared—an "economic" impact statement must be prepared to determine the changes in the Columbia River Gorge economy and job opportunities if the proposed legislation becomes law.

In reviewing the economic information on the Columbia River region, data exists on the labor force, housing, population, income, land use, environmental and fiscal areas as it exists now. As the legislation is proposed it will affect the land uses, labor force opportunities, housing, etc. Therefore effecting and changing the basic economic structure of the region. It seems advisable, prior to any disruption of the local economies, that those who propose this legislation study and understand the impacts resulting from this legislation.

The Mid-Columbia Economic Development District (MCEDD) serves as the major regional coordinator and sponsor of economic development programs. The MCEDD through its Overall Economic Development Plan guides public investment in local and regional economic development. The plan is also used by local and regional officials and citizens as an assessment tool to help formulate and identify future economic needs and direction for the Mid-Columbia area. MCEDD encourages new businesses which are compatible with the area and meet environmental standards. The District also recognizes the potential for increased tourism. The economic directions of the Mid-Columbia area are carefuly assessed as local officials provide direction and input. It is felt that the proposed legislation should be studied and assessed carefully to determine its own impact on the future of the Columbia River Gorge region.

Considerable documentation has been prepared on the area's land uses—past and present. The National Park Service, the Friends of the Gorge, the Washington State Governor's Select Committee and many other entities have researched the problems and potential solution regarding land use, yet no evidence has been prepared or determination of the results been compiled of the effects of the legislation on the economy. Land use is but only one aspect of the local economy, however it is one side of the foundation composing the Mid-Columbia area's economy. When you shift the basic foundation on which an area depends upon, economic disruption occurs.

To exists and prosper in today's interrelated economy for a businessman—land, labor and capital must be present. The existence for an "economy" in simple terms requires the same inputs as business. The Mid-Columbia region uses the lands, induces capital to finance appropriate needs resuting in jobs. These jobs then supply the next economic tier with capital for existence and growth. Each tier supplements the total economy, building an interrelationship. Each tier multiplies itself and is dependent upon the basic job opportunities available within that economy.

The Mid-Columbia' economy was established on natural resources. River and rail transportation, fishing, timber, agricuture and natural beauty were the first inducements for settling here. Derivatives of each resource soon developed. Improvement of the transportation system, harnessing of the Columbia River power, and mechanisms to handle and process the produced regionally soon followed. Therefore the Mid-Columbia economy's first economic tier began with the natural resources and their required amenities. The basic economic drivers are still present and exhibit specific characteristics.

In the past decade agriculture and timber have been the most widespread economic activities. This type of economic base fluctuates due to weather, outside influences and government interaction resulting in cyclical employment and unstableness in the labor force. When a downturn occurs in these basic drivers the subsequent tiers of processing, transportation, handling, selling and attached services also exhibit a downturn. This spiral effect occurs in all areas but is more widely felt here in the Mid-Columbia region due to its dependence on timber and agriculture. Recently poor returns in the agriculture sector and major changes in the timber industry have reduced the long-term dependence on these areas, yet a majority of the economic activity still is derived from them.

With heavy dependence on the natural resources (timber, agriculture) the area economy is said to be lacking diversity. With diversity in the economy, the health of employment, financial investment and the prospects for the future improves. Presently at this time, seasonal or cyclical unemployment is occuring. There are not enough alternative job opportunities to absorb those unemployed persons. The area's residents experiencing the problems of a resource dependent economy believe there are other alternatives to their historic economic pursuits. These economic problems have placed the spotlight on the regon for some of the highest unemployment in the United States of America.

During the Winter and Spring of 1981–82 Skamania County had the highest unemployment rate in the nation at 34.5 percent. Klickitat County was not far behind at 30.5 percent. Wasco, Sherman and Hood River Counties were somewhat buffered with major firms such as Diamond Fruit and Martin Marietta providing stablization—yet the unemployment rates reached 12 percent and 17 respectively. During last year, Diamond Fruit canning facility in Hood River closed down permanently, resulting in a loss of 3–3.5 million dollars of direct salaries per annum. Martin Marietta Aluminum laid off over 350 people and during the 1982 fiscal year the corporation had a net loss of 60 million dollars. These impacts have only begun to be felt.

These diversity problems and the cyclical nature of the historic economic drivers are the reasons for interests in seeking economic alternatives. A non-profit organization has been formed to search for alternatives. This entity—"Mid-Columbia Marketing" believes that locating new industry and encouraging local business expansion to provide new job opportunities for local residents is possible. MCM is pursuing these directions for the future of the region.

The Mid-Columbia Economic Development District and the Mid-Columbia Marketing Association strongly support and encourage economic diversity. Through improvement and replacement of employment opportunities this diversification will occur. These are the first and second goals of nine overall development goals that MCEDD promotes. The expansion of the Mid-Columbia tourism industry is also addressed as a goal.

Tourism and industrial development will provide diversification for the region. Both endeavors require substantial investment of land, and financial resources, resulting in increased job opportunities. Presently, much investment goes unused through those unemployed and the closing of many local facilities.

Industrial development has been increasing within the Columbia River Gorge and securing a haven for economic stableness. This development is composed of light industrial facilities, including (1) ethanol production plan, (2) outdoor equipment manufacture, (3) textile assembly plant, (4) fish processing, (5) hi density foam insulation manufacture, (6) electronic assembly business, (7) secondary technical wood processing plant, plus many others. This list exhibits diversity and these firms each employ from 5 to 100+ employees. Light and medium industrialization of this type in the Columbia River Gorge is compatible and is the present intent of local economic developers. Still it must be kept in mind that cyclical employment exists and the region's major economic drivers are the extraction based sectors.

Many years of appreciating the geological features of the Mid-Columbia region has compelled people to wish that the tourism business would become a major economic reality of the area. This history of tourism within the Gorge is long and detailed, primarily exclusively promoted by the private entrepreneur. In the recent past, public entities have shown off the area's attributes at the Multnomah Falls, Bonneville Dam fish and dam exhibit. The Dalles Dam train ride, etc. It is proposed in the legislation that the Columbia Gorge's competitive advantage lies in the realization of the tourism industry.

As an overview of the tourism industry, there are potentials and problems in its development. Tourism cycles with the seasons, activities, and regional demand changes—exhibiting the same timed cycles of the already present base drivers. Major attractions and requests for tourism dollars are strongest in the summer. This period of the year presently has heavy demands for the same facilities that the tourist industry expects. These services are ample water and disposal of wastes, recreation facilities, including beaches, marinas, and other public acesses. The hard uses can be offset within the user fees and additional service taxes. To adequately plan for the increased usage, tourism data needs to exist specifically detailing the users, timing of the usage and other costs contributed by increased demand on public services.

Travel and tourism is already a major source of economic activity for most states and cities in the U.S. The travel business, in general, are service and service oriented retail businesses. The fact that the travel industry is not geographically limited, has implications for all aspects of economic development. But planning research and data collection are a must to produce effective economic sectors.

Income and job opportunities are positive and exhibit problems for the Mid-Columbia region. Because of the cyclical nature of tourism the job openings occur at the same time as the fruit processing job needs. This could result in lost opportunities or major influxes of short-term job searchers. Again, potentially spiraling off other concerns, such as the housing constraints. Also, on the average, low hourly wages are the norm for these seasonal jobs. On the positive side these additional jobs could provide increases in family income for the part-time and/or seasonal employment available in the travel business.

"Planning" is a word and concept that evokes ambivalent perceptions in the U.S., depending on the context of its use. When used in the context of the individual firm, organization or even family unit, the perception generally is positive—something to be admired. But when conceived in the broader application involving many entities—governments, businesses and citizens, it may well bring out the negative feelings.

There are a number of reasons why the more comprehensive multi-organizational concept is beneficial to the realization of tourism's benefits—especially in the more rural and small city areas. Among these are the following:

(1) Interdependences—tourism is a consumer/traveler concept rather than a supplier/seller concept. Lodging facilities can't be successfully developed unless there are reasons for people to want to be at that place. But for the most part, these "attractions" are provided by organizations other than the lodging supplier, thus leading to a "chicken or egg" problem for pleasure based tourism.

(2) Community harmony—if no direction is provided, less desirable developments which have limited reversibility may take place. These can lead to the kind of tourism that has negative effects for significant sectors of the community. For example, there may be incursions into residential areas, or substitution for residents serving businesses and services by those more tourist serving. One of the problems that can develop as tourism increases in an area is congestion on streets and highways. When considered in advance, these problems handled can be minimized or avoided.

(3) Sound growth—many of the new or expanding businesses serving travelers will be small retail or service firms. Typically such businesses have high rates of failure in initial years. In significant part this is due to resource limitations in acquiring adequate market information. The larger scale planning effort can obtain consequent disruption to a community's economy.

(4) Community's acceptance—design of a comprehensive plan generally will involve a broad spectrum of people, community interests, including public and quasi-public agencies. Opportunity for input into the direction and scope of development plus increased awareness and understanding of the needs and benefits, will help to avoid later conflict and encourage continuing community support as all of the impacts of tourism growth are felt.

(5) Resources acquisition—funds for investment are more rapidly available if analyses and forecasts show that the investments will be successful. Moreover, many public funding agencies, particularly at the federal level, have social criteria for grants and loans. The planning process can provide the evidence needed to obtain investment and/or operation for both public and private tourism development projects.

Additionally, one of the principal information components will, or should be, assessment of the availability of human resources—both labor and entrepreneurial talent. And, it will indicate where and what specific special training or skills may be needed.

The preceeding cover only some of the reasons why a comprehensive planning processs for tourism is valuable.

To briefly summarize—the proposed legislation will affect the region's economy bringing a choice between the preservation of natural habitat and the preservation of the local resident's jobs. As it has been mentioned, a delicate balance exists, and if this legislation goes through without precise and adequate determinations, this balance will be displaced. We question whether this would be in the best interest of the people.

MCEDD recommends the Congressmen pursue a course we at the local level have found useful. That is to favor policies which both preserve the natural habitat of the Columbia Gorge and promote the continuation and replacement of employment opportunities here. This course is in the best interests of the people.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Mr. Lindstrom.

STATEMENT OF STEPHEN LINDSTROM, PACIFIC NORTHWEST WATERWAYS

Mr. **LINDSTROM**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, good day.

I am Stephen R. Lindstrom, executive vice president of the Pacific Northwest Waterways Association. I very much appreciate the opportunity to testify before you today.

I want to emphasize that the remarks I will make merely highlight a number of the concerns and thoughts that we have on this matter, and that as the discussion progresses we would hope to participate appropriately.

Our concerns today surround the issue of the preservation of the Columbia River Gorge and the promotion of tourism herein. It is also appropriate that the business and trade interests join tourism as concerns of your subcommittee, since especially in the case before us today they are inextricably linked.

The Columbia River Gorge is, indeed, a national treasure. Not only is it dear to us, it is useful to us in a multitude of ways. The scenic, historic, cultural, economic, transportation, hydropower, environmental, and other values of the gorge add a great deal to an already rich region and Nation. These values are intertwined, no one of them being more prominent than the others.

P.N.W.A. feels very strongly that any effort to overemphasize a particular value, while ignoring or deemphasizing other values, is wrong. That is why we are skeptical of the proposed legislation establishing a national scenic area in the gorge. We'd hasten to add, though, that we strongly support the promotion of tourism and trade in and through the gorge. Tourism can and does exist only under encouraging economic conditions. No one but the perverted purposely travels in America to sightsee the down-and-out, the unemployed, and the less fortunate in our land. Hence, a vital, healthy economy, growing if not booming, is an essential element in tourism promotion.

Tourists enjoy being a part of good times. In addition, tourists must themselves have money in order to afford travel. We cannot ignore—I say aside—that many of the potential tourists in this area are from the Pacific Northwest region, just a day's drive from the area in which we sit.

Therefore, active tourism and a generally health economy are closely linked. Our economy is suffering. Here in the gorge, unemployment affects one household in three in some areas. The production of forest products has skidded to depression levels; logging and mill activity are but an echo of their former operating levels; construction has come to a grinding halt. Throughout the Pacific Northwest, economic conditions are worse than in most other regions of the country.

The national and world economies continue to suffer, as well. American productivity languishes, as do other economic indicators. We have some transportation activity documented here to indicate the severity of this recession. First, 41 percent of the Nation's merchant marine fleet is idle, representing 23 percent of that fleet's capacity. Second, 25 percent of the Nation's railroad freight cars are idle, up from an average of 2.5 percent, which usually just reflects the lull between crop seasons.

To elaborate just a moment, that means 265,000 freight cars, out of a fleet of 1.1 million, are underutilized or not utilized at all.

Third, rail traffic dropped from 912 billion ton miles in 1981 to 735 billion ton miles in 1982, a decrease of 19 percent. Fourth, production and delivery of new rail cars dropped from 90,000 in 1979 to 85,900 in 1980, to 44,900 in 1981, and down to 18,000 in 1982. Hence, then, the dollars invested in new rolling stock dropped from $3.6 billion in 1980 to $1.1 billion last year.

Sixth, dry cargo barges are operating at 70 percent of capacity. Bulk cargo barges are operating at a level of 60 percent to 70 percent of capacity.

At our own Bonneville lock, traffic dropped during 1982 13 percent, from 9.7 million tons to 8.4 million tons. However, congestion and safety still continue to be problems at Bonneville, even with the respite in traffic there. All in all, a dismal situation.

However, some encouraging news must also be included to round out the picture. Recent congressional activity has provided for the formation of export trading companies, a possible boon to Northwest businesses. Talk continues of increased coal exports from the Pacific Coast. A recent report of the Corps of Engineers suggests a favorable cost-benefit ratio for deepening the mouth of the Columbia River. A new dredge is on its way to the Pacific Northwest to help keep our ports and waterways maintained. Interest rates are lower than they have been, encouraging talk of improvement in the housing industry.

Yet in the midst of these glimmers of hope of recovery, two negative elements raise their heads. Oregon continues to receive a dismal rating for its business climate—43d worst in the Nation; and the prospect of reintroduction of the National Scenic Area legislation looms.

This is a constraining rather than a nurturing act, in our opinion, as it was written in the last Congress; especially regarding multiple use of our resources, and most prominently affecting transportation. A number of unacceptable results of the proposed legislation will contribute to continuation of depressed economic conditions in the Northwest, while only possibly contributing to improvement of tourism.

Specifically, the proposed legislation, first, makes no provision for completion of the new lock at Bonneville Dam. Now, digressing for a moment, Senator, I know that you, Senator Hatfield, and others, express a strong support for the new lock at Bonneville Dam. But, the draft legislation that we saw last year did not make those provisions.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you something. Do you think if the draft legislation does not specifically mention everything that can be built, constructed, or anything else, that it is precluded?

Mr. LINDSTROM. Not at all, sir. I'm listing these just as examples that the legislation might add hurdles to the pursuit of.

If coal starts to move through the Columbia River Gorge, as has been proposed and has been, I believe, supported by you, Senator Packwood, that activity will push more local goods onto the waterway, intensifying the need for timely completion of the new lock—and I emphasize "timely completion of the new lock"—again the removal of hurdles, rather than the addition of them.

I'm sure Mr. Burnett will comment on this later on.

Second, the proposed legislation makes no provision for or no accommodation for new hydroelectric transmission lines from and through the Columbia River Gorge, eliminating the possibility of additional interchange of power with the Southwest, or at least making it extremely difficult. This is a possible source, now and in the future, of income to the B.P.A. and to consumers in the Pacific Northwest.

Third, the proposed legislation makes no provision for existing industrial activity to continue operating in a normal manner—that is, upgrading and improving equipment as technological or market demands might occur—therefore, squeezing the future employment and tax bases in the gorge abnormally. Any future industry is virtually prohibited, as I read the draft legislation.

Fourth, it fails to recognize the absolute necessity of the Columbia River as a continuing artery of commerce in America's transportation network. Essential to rail, barge, and truck movement of cargo, the gorge is and must continue to be an unimpeded route for domestic and foreign cargoes, a route that is environmentally attractive, energy efficient, and vital to our national defense.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you a question there. As I indicated, we have no bill before us, and Senator Hatfield and I have agreed that we would wait until these hearings were over before we draft one.

Mr. LINDSTROM. I understand, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. But in the bill last year what specific danger was there to the ports? We intended none, and didn't see any. Could you be very specific so we don't make the same mistake again, if we draft a bill? How did it injure or endanger the ports?

Mr. LINDSTROM. Well, local port activities, especially local ports, but waterway activities generally suffered mostly just by exclusion. There were no provisions made for them. Yet there were detailed provisions made for countervailing uses of the resources about which we're concerned. Land use, interchange activities if you would, things such as that.

There are currently five or six projects on the drawing board or under the planning or construction stage amongst the port districts here in the gorge. They are not as major as the coal port under construction in Portland; yet, each one, incrementally, adds to the attractiveness and diversity of local economic activity. An example is the——

The CHAIRMAN. I want to make sure what you're driving at in terms of the legislation. You are saying that everything that is not specifically permitted is, in your mind, excluded?

Mr. LINDSTROM. Well, that appears to be the cant, if you would, of the legislation, the tilt, the bias if you would—well, I don't guess bias is a neutral word. But, in the nonnegative sense of the word "bias"—the angle of the drafted legislation from the previous Congress indicated to me that preservation would be a norm, a looking backward, if you would; and, that any future accommodation of most human activities was not provided for except as an exceptional activity.

The further from local control we get, then, the more compounded that concern becomes.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you be happy if the legislation read something as follows: "Everything shall be allowed except what the commission disallows"?

Mr. LINDSTROM. That would be wonderful, sir, if I could chair the commission.

Let me wrap this up, if I might. I really believe there is a gap between what has been said about the legislation that was introduced last session and what it actually says in writing. Speaking to that, I believe there are some platitudes being set forth that would lead to large-scale intrusion of the Federal establishment. This kind of activity promotes elitism, not tourism. Only the very rich and the very fit benefit from huge areas of land from which human enterprise is excluded.

The threats of population growth in the gorge are not substantiated by fact. From 1960 to 1980, the population of the gorge counties grew but 17 percent. That's less than 1,000 persons per year. The Portland metropolitan area grew 44 percent.

In addition, considerable steps have been taken recently by local government to control growth in the future, especially on the Washington side of the river.

Many examples abound of successful tourism promotion without heavy Federal involvement or land use control. The most prominent is the Oregon coast, where State government took the lead role in land acquisition, improvement and promotion through the State park system.

In addition, in this area, the Mid-Columbia Marketing group from whom this hearing will hear, has been in a nurturing sense successful, and I expect great things from it as a non-Federal promotional activity.

Washington State last year, during severe economic times, found $4.5 million to devote to tourist promotion. They expect a return of $13 for each $1 they spent, just out of that short shot, if you would, in a 7- or 8-month period.

Private foundations, local governments, and regional associations of government, and especially the nature conservancy, have provided environmental preservation of sensitive areas by means other than Federal control. Now, I'll confess to blurring the line here between environmental preservation and tourism promotion, because the parallel between the two, if any, has been heavily emphasized by promoters of scenic area acts.

One thing I would note, with a great deal of satisfaction, is that the largest tourist draw in the region, if not in the whole Northwest, is the Bonneville Dam, a prominent example of the multiple use of the natural resources in this region; and, for my opinion, man's positive stewardship of those resources.

We contend that successful tourist promotion cannot only coexist with other human enterprise, but is further nurtured by it. Destroying or substantially altering the human environment in the gorge should continue to be as unlawful as destroying or altering the environment of any other endangered species.

In conclusion, we suggest the following. Continue to have an interest in the activities in the gorge, all activities, insisting that they are healthy and balanced. Two, support strong local planning, coordination of planning efforts between and among the gorge counties, and public participation in the planning process. Three, support a regional or bistate oversight commission. Four, establish and support a conservancy trust for acquisition and protection of key critical lands, with sustenance of such an effort coming from interested citizens and groups both from within and outside the gorge, rather than from the already strapped Federal coffers. And, five, urge the State governments of Washington and Oregon to shoulder their joint and several responsibilities in guaranteeing the gorge remain a showplace of the success of the concept of multiple use.

If legislation is introduced, we urge that a number of hearings be held in the gorge, so that the citizens and businesses most closely affected can be heard at length. Further, we urge that the record of this hearing be kept open for at least 60 days in order for you to receive further written comments.

With that, we thank you for the opportunity to speak. We will continue to provide information as it's appropriate. I'd be happy to respond to any questions.

Thank you, Senator.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Mr. Lindstrom, I am curious on your conclusions, the five points. No. 3 is support a regional or bistate oversight commission; what powers would that commission have?

Mr. **LINDSTROM**. Although I have not received total support from my organization on this, my personal opinion would be that the oversight commission would have not only the opportunity to review significant land use decisions in the affected area, but also—oh, an appellate-type role, in being able to reverse or remand local decisions.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Based upon what? That they don't meet a certain standard?

Mr. **LINDSTROM**. Well, perhaps based upon criteria drawn by the formulators of the commission. I think that should be the State Legislatures of Oregon and Washington.

The **CHAIRMAN**. In other words, you would give this oversight commission power to reverse the counties and to have some kind of uniform planning, and take away from the local governments the absolute right to zone as they want or control as they want?

Mr. **LINDSTROM**. Not to any degree beyond what it currently exists, for example under S. 100's provisions in the State of Oregon, which are pretty stringent provisions.

The **CHAIRMAN**. You mean L.C.D.C.'s provisions?

Mr. **LINDSTROM**. Yes, sir. There is a mechanism in Oregon now for that kind of oversight activity.

The **CHAIRMAN**. I'm curious, would you advocate that? In essence, a regional land conservation and development commission that would have the same powers that the L.C.D.C. does in Oregon?

Mr. **LINDSTROM**. Of a similar nature, yes, sir. However, I would deemphasize the Federal role. Not to the exclusion of Federal interests, because the significant landowner in the area of discussion here is the Federal Establishment.

The **CHAIRMAN**. I want to come back to that again, because L.C.D.C. is quite controversial in Oregon. As far as you're concerned, you would not mind having a bistate commission with reasonably similar powers to Oregon's L.C.D.C., which could require local plans to meet a standard set by L.C.D.C. and could turn them down if they didn't meet that standard, and could make uniform planning decisions for the gorge?

Mr. **LINDSTROM**. Uniform to the degree that perhaps this oversight commission would accept county and municipal plans as they currently exist or are in the future formulated; and, then, should there be significant exception taken to those plans, for whatever purpose, then upon objection or appeal this oversight commission could then, with some sort of hammer, exert an influence over whether or not those exceptions are made.

Now, I do not advocate uniform land use planning for the gorge. That, to me, is still an inherent function of local government. To say uniform, you imply that you impose the same standards from one end of the gorge to the other. Just the rainfall differential makes that somewhat ludicrous, almost, in my estimation.

The CHAIRMAN. But, as a rule of thumb, you wouldn't be unhappy with a regional L.C.D.C.?

Mr. LINDSTROM. Not as it affects the quad-county region with the little tail of Multnomah and Clark Counties tucked in at the lower end. I would emphasize the need for a heavy emphasis on local participants in that oversight commission, with some input from State government, and a voice for the Federal role, as well.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you, How long have you lived in the area?

Mr. LINDSTROM. I've lived in Clark County for 3 years. I'm a native of and recently worked in eastern Oregon, just 40 or 50 miles beyond the limits of the gorge.

The CHAIRMAN. For how long there?

Mr. LINDSTROM. Well, I was born in 1946 in Ione.

The CHAIRMAN. OK. Now, I'm curious, you say examples abound of successful tourism promotion without heavy Federal involvement or land use control, and the most prominent is the Oregon coast where State government took a lead in land acquisition.

Are you familiar with the history of that, the beach bill?

Mr. LINDSTROM. In bits and pieces, yes, sir. I've not been an avid student of it, per se.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I was in the legislature when that bill passed. Governor McCall pushed it, to his everlasting credit. What we had was an emergency situation because of some local entanglements where there was not just a possibility, but the inevitability, that unless action was taken the Oregon coast was going to be developed very commercially, with apartments on the beaches or close to them.

So the legislature passed a beach bill, by and large putting the Oregon coast in the control of the State for all practical purposes. This was done over the strong objections of the coastal counties. They said there was no local input, that it was not the State's business, and that they were entitled to have the major hand because they lived there. The State of Oregon said that it was such a critical area to the entire State that we are going to, in essence, run it from the State level.

Do you agree with that decision?

Mr. LINDSTROM. I have no quarrel with it, for two reasons. No. 1, I wasn't personally involved at the time, and not emotionally involved. No.2, it's worked out remarkably well.

The CHAIRMAN. But the State took away from the local governments the right to control their own destinies.

Mr. LINDSTROM. It did, indeed. Many people feel S. 100 did that in land use planning across the State. I have mixed feelings on that. I think the majority of the impacts of S. 100, or the establishment of the Department of Land Conservation and Development, have been positive.

The **Chairman**. So you have no misgiving about the Oregon State government, in essence, zoning the coast—even though most of us don't live there but only visit there—that's still OK?

Mr. **Lindstrom**. I'm not so concerned about the process as I am the result. The result is that a non-Federal activity has occurred that's increased and enhanced the tourist activities on the coast. That was my point in using that as an example.

The **Chairman**. That's why I want to come back to this regional L.C.D.C. You're not really advocating local control—I mean county control. You would have no objection to a State or bistate agency that would have the same powers over the gorge that the State of Oregon has taken over the Oregon coast?

Mr. **Lindstrom**. I wouldn't draw that strong a parallel. I would draw that approximate parallel, Senator, to the degree that the bistate commission would be the highest to which an appeal of local decisionmaking could be made regarding——

The **Chairman**. Well, that is significantly different than the way Oregon runs the coast. This is not an appeal board.

Mr. **Lindstrom**. Yes, and I used the coast as a limited example of how a non-Federal entity has promoted tourism—the Twenty Miracle Miles concept, a number of things, of course, the chain of State parks.

The **Chairman**. As a matter of fact, it was the Twenty Miracle Miles that led to the creation of the beach bill.

Mr. **Lindstrom**. The 1950's version of the Twenty Miracle Miles. But, I've seen it in recent years spoken to in less harsh terms.

The **Chairman**. The Twenty Miracle Miles were an example of local promotion of tourism that the State said should not go any further.

Mr. **Lindstrom**. Porobably in the original concept it was. I can't disagree, no, sir.

The **Chairman**. Thank you.

Mr. **Lindstrom**. Thank you.

The **Chairman**. Howard Burnett from the Union Pacific.

How many years have we dealt together, Howard, 25 or 30 years?

STATEMENT OF HOWARD BURNETT, UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD

Mr. **Burnett**. Quite a few, sir.

The **Chairman**. He is one of the extraordinary gentlemen I've run across who never asks for my time except when it is absolutely necessary that he see me about some problem involving the Union Pacific. He never fails to come totally prepared. And he is better than almost anybody I know, lobbyist or otherwise, in explaining an issue. If I were to say, "Howard, what is the other side of your position, if you had to argue it?" He can normally argue the other side better than his opponents can argue the other side.

Howard Burnett, Union Pacific.

Mr. **Burnett**. Thank you, Senator.

The previous witness mentioned a similarity between—well, not a similarity, but some difference between Omaha and this region.

The **Chairman**. Yes, Omaha's the headquarters of the Union Pacific.

Mr. **Burnett**. I lived there almost 20 years. I'll certainly agree with you, there is a difference.

The Columbia River Gorge is a wonder and a treasure to this region, and I think to the United States. It is also a primary transportation route in the Pacific Northwest. As such, it is quite important to both the ecology and the economy of the region. It is appropriate for the scenic and cultural values of the gorge to be enhanced without eroding its economic importance. It is equally appropriate, I feel, for its economic value to be preserved and enhanced without eroding that importance.

Legislation affecting the gorge will serve the true interests of the Northwest and the Nation only if both the economic and ecological interests and concerns are recognized, balanced, and their respective values preserved.

The Union Pacific Railroad has been a long-time resident of the Columbia River Gorge. Fact is, we've been here some 100 years. During that period of time, we've enhanced the value of the gorge as a transportation corridor by construction, maintenance, and operation of what we feel is an outstanding transportation facility.

The transportation needs of the Northwest and the Nation require that this transportation facility be maintained and modernized to meet the needs of interstate and foreign commerce. The Union Pacific Railroad Co.'s purpose in being here today is to insure that any Federal legislation enacted to address these issues does not inadvertently impair the continuing role of the gorge as a major transportation corridor.

Accordingly, I'm submitting for your consideration some suggestions for changes to the previous bill that had been presented. They're quite in detail, so I'll just excerpt them briefly in this statement.

These amendments specifically recognize transportation as an appropriate use of land in the gorge, and to allow for the repair and restoration of transportation facilities in critical areas. Should we have a derailment or some accident, we feel that we should have the access to immediately go in and restore the transportation; and, to do so without prior consent of any gorge management agency.

These changes that I've suggested will allow the gorge to remain a major transportation corridor, while also preserving its scenic and cultural values. We respectfully request that these concerns be addressed and incorporated in the draft of any future Federal legislation which is proposed relating to the Columbia River Gorge.

I have reviewed this matter with Ted Michon, who is the vice president of the Burlington Northern. Regrettably, he didn't give me his proxy, but he generally concurs with this particular statement.

We feel that some orderly control in the development is necessary, and this can only be handled by some nonbiased group supervising it and overseeing it.

Thank you, sir.

The **Chairman**. Howard, thank you. I have no questions.

He has submitted some very specific legislation and detailed amendments relating to the Union Pacific. Again, as usual, it's very clear, very understandable, and I appreciate it.

Mr. **Burnett**. Our lawyers had something to do with that.

The **Chairman**. I see Jim Bergmann's name on it, as a matter of fact.

[The statement follows:]

STATEMENT OF HOWARD BURNETT, UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD CO.

The Columbia River Gorge is a scenic wonder and a primary transportation route in the Pacific Northwest. As such, it is uniquely important to both the ecology and economy of this region. It is appropriate for the scenic and cultural values of the Gorge to be enhanced without eroding its economic importance. It is equally appropriate for its economic value to be preserved and enhanced without eroding its scenic and cultural importance. Legislation affecting the Gorge will serve the true interests of the Northwest and the Nation only if both economic and ecological interests and concerns are recognized, balanced and their respective values preserved.

Union Pacific Railroad Company has been a century long resident of the Columbia River Gorge and has enhanced the value of the Gorge as a transportation corridor by construction, maintenance and operation of an outstanding transportation facility. The transportation needs of the Northwest and the Nation require that this transportation facility be maintained and modernized to meet the needs of interstate and foreign commerce. Union Pacific Railroad Company's purpose in being here today is to ensure that any federal legislation enacted to address these issues does not inadvertently impair the continuing role of the Gorge as a major transportation corridor. Accordingly, I am submitting for your consideration suggested amendments which Union Pacific Railroad drafted with respect to the proposed Columbia River Gorge Act of 1982. These amendments specifically recognize transportation as an appropriate use of land in the Gorge and to allow for the repair and restoration of transportation facilities in "critical areas" without the prior consent of the Gorge's management agency. These changes will allow the Gorge to remain a major transportation corridor while also preserving its scenic and cultural values. We respectfully request that these concerns be addressed and incorporated in the draft of any future federal legislation which is proposed relating to the Columbia River Gorge.

COMMENTS ON THE COLUMBIA RIVER GORGE ACT OF 1982

The Columbia River Gorge is a scenic wonder and a primary transportation route in the Pacific Northwest. The Columbia River Gorge Act of 1982, as introduced by Senator Packwood (S. 2318) and Senator Hatfield (S. 2319) on March 31, 1982, specifically recognizes the Gorge as a spectacular canyon of compelling and majestic beauty as well as an important and historic transportation gateway between the Pacific Ocean and the interior of the North American Continent. Today, products move through the Gorge by rail, truck and barge. Its use for transportation purposes is a vital component of the economy of this country and, in particular, the economy of the Pacific Northwest.

Any legislation addressing future uses of the Gorge must preserve both its beauty and its importance as a transportation corridor. These comments recommend revisions to the bills which would more accurately reflect the need to preserve both ecological and transportation characteristics of the Gorge.

Union Pacific and its predecessors have operated a railroad through the Gorge for almost 100 years. Union Pacific's sole main line connection linking the Pacific Northwest and the interior continent is located along the southerly bank of the Columbia River between Biggs, Oregon, and Troutdale, Oregon. More than 30 million tons of freight are moved on this line each year. Union Pacific has invested millions of dollars in constructing, maintaining, improving and operating its railroad facilities in the Columbia River Gorge to provide the public with the best possible rail service at reasonable cost.

Union Pacific is proud of the excellent standards which its construction engineers have applied and maintained throughout the Railroad's century-long presence in the Gorge. Clearly, the builders of our railroad had a healthy respect for the geological forces which make the Gorge majestic and mighty. As a result, the Union Pacific and the Gorge have had a relatively peaceful co-existence. Union Pacific has also recognized the general public's desire to view and photograph spectacular scenery in the Gorge and, as an accommodation of that desire, recently relocated its communication lines from an area adjacent to Multnomah Falls at a cost of approximately $40,000 in order to improve the view of the Falls. However, our ability to properly maintain and operate our Gorge route as an essential transportation facility must not be impaired by legislatively-imposed constraints.

We therefore have prepared the following suggested revisions to S. 2318 and S. 2319 as introduced on March 31, 1982. These proposed revisions reinforce the balance between scenic and economic considerations which must be preserved and are extremely important to ensure that Union Pacific will be able to continue its operations through the Gorge to meet the present and future needs of interstate and foreign commerce. Union Pacific respectfully urges amendments to the bills substantially as hereinafter outlined.

1. *Recognition of transportation as an appropriate use of land in the Gorge.* The purposes of the Act should specifically recognize the important transportation characteristics of the Gorge and recognize that transportation is an appropriate use of lands within the Gorge Area.

Section 5(b)(3) of S. 2318 and Section 6(b)(3) of S. 2319 provide that the Management Plan will "designate appropriate uses of all lands within the gorge area." The bills do not acknowledge that all existing uses are appropriate and there is a clear intent expressed that all nonconforming uses will be abated. However, the bills do recognize existing Federal uses of land as appropriate. This recognition should not be limited to Federal uses of land but should be extended to encompass existing public uses of land, including lands dedicated to common carrier transportation in interstate and foreign commerce.

It is important also that any legislation enunciating national policy relating to planning for or development of the Gorge should facilitate construction and maintenance of transportation facilities needed in the future. During the 1930's, Union Pacific's Locating Engineer H. J. Roberts developed long-term projections of railroad line changes required to improve railroad transportation facilities throughout the Columbia River Gorge Area. These are commonly referred to as the "Roberts Projections" and they have been respected and followed in the upgrading of the old Columbia River Highway to the present Interstate Highway and in the construction of Bonneville, The Dalles and John Day Dams. These projections are as vital to the economic value of the Gorge as specific geological formations are to its scenic beauty.

It is uncontroverted that the railroad transportation facilities throughout the Gorge must be preserved, modernized and expanded as necessary to meet the needs of interstate and foreign commerce. This could involve construction of additional transportation facilities, including main line tracks, extension of existing sidings, construction of new sidings, and construction or extension of train control or communication systems. Changes required to improve rail transportation through the Gorge should be allowed without legislation-imposed constraints.

Consistent with the foregoing, Amendments are respectfully requested to Sections 2(b) (1) and (4) of each Act and to Section 5(b)(3) of S. 2318 and 6(b)(3) of S. 2319 as follows:

SEC. 2. (b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to protect, conserve, and enhance the scenic, natural, cultural, and other resource values of existing [Federal] *public uses of* property located in the Columbia River Gorge, including *Federal* lands administered by the United States Forest Service, the United States Bureau of Land Management, the Army Corps of Engineers, and lands included in the [Interstate Highway System] *national transportation system;*

* * * * * * *

(4) to protect [and] perpetuate *and promote* the existing economy of the Columbia River Gorge, including agriculture, fishing, *transportation facilities,* existing hydroelectric facilities, and timber utilization, and the character of human habitation, in harmony with the existing visual landscape, and by promoting economic development with the gorge which [enhances] *is consistent with* the existing scenic and natural character of the Columbia River Gorge and which promotes public awareness of the historical, cultural, *scenic* and natural values of the area and which supports and enhances the economic livelihood of the gorge by encouraging growth to occur in the existing incorporate communities by recognizing compatible historic economic pursuits, such as farming, grazing, forestry, and orcharding, outside the communities as appropriate to preserve the existing character of the gorge, and by enhancing the potential of the gorge for increased tourism;

MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR AREA

S. 2318 5, S. 2319 Section 6(b) CONTENT.—The Management Plan shall—

* * * * * * *

(2) protect, maintain, and enhance the scenic, natural, [and] cultural , *economic and other resource* values of the Area and shall include plans for resource protection, interpretation, and visitor use, [including development of] *and assure preservation and expansion of existing transportation and* public use areas and facilities *and development of appropriate additional facilities;*

2. *Need to make emergency repairs in critical areas.* Section 6(a) of S. 2318 provides that no construction, modification or reconstruction can be undertaken pending adoption of interim guidelines by the Secretary of Agriculture which govern activities in the "critical" portion of the Area. Section 5(a) of S. 2319 prohibits construction or modification *in critical areas* until a final plan is completed unless an application is filed and at least eight Commission members approve. Taken literally, these sections would totally prohibit any emergency reconstruction which Union Pacific must perform to repair slides, washouts, and damage due to accidents. The Union Pacific line bisects several "critical" areas as does the Interstate Highway System. It is not practical to try to freeze *all* activity in these areas, even during an interim period, and it is requested that the need to preserve, repair or restore existing transportation or other public facilities be recognized by amending Section 6(a) of S. 2318 and Section 5(a) of S. 2319 as follows:

S. 2318 INTERIM PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT

SEC. 6. (a) MORATORIUM ON NEW USES IN CRITICAL LANDS.—Pending the adoption of interim guidelines pursuant to subsection (b), no person *other than an authority or entity having the power of eminent domain* may construct [or modify any new building or facility or reconstruct] or substantially modify any existing building or facility *or construct additional facilities* in any portion of the area designated as critical on the map filed pursuant to section 3(b)(2).

S. 2319 INTERIM PROTECTION

SEC. 5. (a) MORATORIUM ON NEW USES IN CRITICAL PORTIONS.—Pending final approval of the Management Plan under Section 6, no person *other than an authority or entity which has the power of eminent domain* may construct or *substantially* modify any building or *facility or construct additional facilities* within any critical portion of the Area unless, upon application of such person, the Commission determines by a vote of eight or more of its members that such construction or modification is consistent with the purposes of this Act and is compatible with the existing character of land use in that portion of the Area in which such building or facility is located and that such construction or modification will not harm or degrade the resources of the Area.

SUMMARY

The Columbia River Gorge is uniquely important to the ecology and economy of the Northwest. It is appropriate for the scenic and cultural value of the Gorge to be preserved and enhanced without eroding its economic importance. It is equally appropriate for its economic value to be preserved and enhanced without eroding its scenic and cultural importance. Legislation affecting the Gorge will serve the true interest of the Northwest and the nation only if both economic and ecological interests and concerns are recognized, balanced and their respective values preserved.

As a century-long "resident" of the Columbia River Gorge, Union Pacific has enhanced the natural value of the Columbia River Gorge as a transportation corridor by construction, maintenance and operation of an outstanding transportation needs of the Northwest and of the nation require that this transportation facility be maintained and modernized to meet the needs of interstate and foreign commerce. Union Pacific intends to meet these needs and the proposed legislation should be amended to assure it will be able to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, thank you very much.

Now, let's go on with the next panel. Bill Hemingway of Mid-Columbia Marketing, Jim Carpenito of Columbia Gorge United, and Mr. William Benson, Skamania County Commissioner.

STATEMENTS OF WILLIAM HEMINGWAY, MID-COLUMBIA MARKETING AND COLUMBIA GORGE VISITORS' ASSOCIATION, HOOD RIVER, OREG.; JIM CARPENITO, PRESIDENT, COLUMBIA GORGE UNITED, STEVENSON, WASH., AND HOOD RIVER, OREG.; AND WILLIAM BENSON, COUNTY COMMISSIONER, SKAMANIA COUNTY, WASH.

Mr. HEMINGWAY. Thank you, Senator, for the opportunity to make some remarks here today. As I sat listening to the previous speakers, I tried to do some editing of my remarks so I could keep people somewhat interested, without being too redundant with what's previously been discussed.

The CHAIRMAN. I also might say, to the extent you're interested in being covered by the media, the longer the remarks go on the less likely they are to cover all of them.

Mr. HEMINGWAY. In the marketing business, I guess that is important.

I am Bill Hemingway, the president of Mid-Columbia Marketing. Mid-Columbia Marketing is a private, nonprofit corporation, formed to promote business, industrial, and tourist development in the mid-Columbia region. Mid-Columbia Marketing is a cooperative effort representing a constituency from both Oregon and Washington, five counties in both States, and a dozen or so communities. Ports, chambers of commerce, government, and private business in the five-county area are involved.

Mid-Columbia Marketing is an example, I think, of how a need can be filled from within an area to solve a particular situation. I think we have stepped forward with some possible directions for solutions to what we consider the most pressing problem in the Mid-Columbia area, and that is our economic viability.

I think everyone's aware, from the previous comments that you stated a moment ago, that this is a spectacular area. I'm not sure I've heard enough emphasis on the other things about the area besides the natural beauty. One of our previous speakers mentioned the Bonneville Dam as being a major visitor attraction. I think we also might mention there are two other dams in this area that receive a large number of visitors each year. We have the Goldendale Observatory, which receives a fair number of visitors. Also, we have the giant B.P.A. wind turbines up on Goldendale—when they're running—are also very interesting for people to observe. These are technological attractions rather than natural.

Over 1 million people are within an hour's drive of this area, and in excess of 8 million people within 500 miles drive. Nearly 2 million visitors a year stop at Multnomah Falls, over 300,000 a year visit Cascade locks, and with the new visitors' center at Bonneville we expect we're going to see 1 million or more each year at that particular attraction.

I think it's important to point out that these are people who really don't make much of an impact on our economy. They're sightseers. They don't stay overnight, for the most part. They don't buy many meals. They don't shop in our stores.

We also have between 2 and 3 million cars a year that pass right through the center of the gorge on Interstate 85 at 55 miles an hour, or better. Very few stop or probably even realize what a spectacular area this is. I know I passed through it for almost 20 years and never got up on top of one of these bluffs to really see what is here—never got back to the Ice Caves at Trout Lake, never got back up in the Klickitat Canyon, never got back on the Rowena loops.

Now, Mid-Columbia Marketing is interested in promoting tourism, yes. But, we feel it's important that tourism be promoted at a pace we can handle. We realize there are some deficiencies in the facilities and accommodations to actually provide the kind of an attraction or destination resort many of us would like to see in this area.

We want to help develop the packaging that Shirley Eads was talking about to build this kind of industry in the Mid-Columbia area.

I'd like to move off into another area which is very much related to this, and that's the other part of the economic coin. Local people here are somewhat geared to the seasonal aspects of timber and agriculture industries, but this deep recession has served to dramatize the problems of an area with a narrow economic base, which we clearly have here. As I'm sure you're aware, the Mid-Columbia has experienced some very high unemployment rates in the past 2 years, some counties over 30 percent last year at its peak. We have two counties right now at more than twice the national average in unemployment.

It's obvious to many of us who live here, or most of us, I think, at this point that we need to diversify this economy. Tourism development is a part of that diversification. Mid-Columbia Marketing is dedicated to work in that direction.

But, I'd emphasize that's only one part of it. While tourism can have some economic impact on the area, one of the things in studying this program, and as we got into the marketing program to promote this kind of development, we found out that an awful lot of the jobs involved in tourism are generally low pay, secondary wage earner kinds of jobs.

We need other kinds of jobs here, as well. We need principal wage earner jobs, very badly. Because of climatic conditions, tourism is going to be principally a seasonal activity in the gorge and surroundings. With its peak also in the fall and summer, it probably won't offer much opportunity to fill the employment voids for the timber and agricultural workers.

I guess what I'm saying here is you can't view tourism in a vacuum. It has to be looked at in the perspective of the total economy. Now, as many people said before, this is a multipleuse area. Timber and agriculture are probably going to continue to be the backbone of our area's economy for a long time to come. We also have an important metals industry that is somewhat threatened right now because of power rates and other economic circumstances, and they provide a large number of well-paying jobs and feed a lot of families in this area, and we have to be concerned about them. This area is a major energy center, as I think has been brought up before, a major fisheries resource, and a major trade and transportation corridor. These are all legitimate and well-established uses, not incompatible with the resources of the area.

All these things came about not by chance. There was planning that went into having these things occur. There was cooperation among the various levels of government, and among the various counties and communities in the region. We have an even better mechanism in place right now to deal with growth and development than we've ever had before, and it's improving. It's responding to the pressures and to the activities that are going on now.

The chronic unemployment in the Mid-Columbia can't be addressed by tourism alone. We have to expand the business and industrial sector of the economy. Mid-Columbia Marketing is dedicated to trying to retain existing business, helping them to grow, and bringing in new employers that can provide primary wage earner jobs.

We also have to be concerned about the importance of the area's national and international trade, and try and maintain an economic climate that will allow this river system to continue to grow, because I think most of us realize it's only realized a fraction of its potential; and, we have to also work to insure the improvement of other trade and transportation systems through this Northwest Passage, if you will, and are allowed to continue to grow the way that they should.

We realize, also, this has to be done in the context with due consideration for the natural beauty of the area, which I think most of us realize is probably our major asset, and must be preserved.

Now, any consideration of Federal designation of the gorge has to carefully weigh the tradeoffs. Proponents of Federal designation are quick to point to perceived benefits to tourism by such identity. Realistically, it will probably raise the level of awareness about this very unusual area. It would also, no doubt, insure a strong mechanism for the preservation of the gorge's natural beauty, which also has tourism appeal.

Those in opposition however, especially gorge residents whose lives will be the most impacted, and these will be the people that will have to live with this on a day-to-day basis and not just on a weekend basis or on a once-a-year basis; they're concerned about the potential loss of individual property rights and traditional local jurisdictional prerogatives. They're concerned about the impact of more outside involvement in their individualistic lifestyles.

I think that's very important. You'll find no more independent people anywhere in this country probably than in the Columbia River Gorge. It's a good carryover, I think, from the pioneer days.

Putting all the rhetoric aside—if that's possible—the slick public relations efforts, and the media interpretation of the opposing parties' positions, the definitive information that is available—and, admittedly, it's somewhat limited at this point—indicates that the majority, the vast majority of gorge residents are opposed to Federal intervention and designation. I'll point to a couple of examples here to clarify that.

The Vancouver Columbian conducted a reader survey of opinion regarding Federal intervention in this matter. The results published in their February 10, 1981, edition reflected 84.5 percent in opposition to Federal involvement and in favor of continued local control. I might add that paper comes out of Vancouver, which everyone is aware of, and the major response to that was probably in the Clark County area.

State Senator Hal Zimmerman, whose district is primarily on the Washington side of the river, also conducted a constituent survey that revealed similar results. In November 1981, they held a general election in Skamania County which a referendum measure on this issue, and out of 1,870 votes cast an overwhelming 1,653 supported local control and opposed outside intervention.

There was also a survey conducted by the city of Cascade Locks, a mail-out survey, which the return was over 90 percent, I believe 96 percent, in opposition to Federal intervention in the gorge.

There was another poll, and I'm not sure how relevant this is because it deals not with the people in the gorge and that's really what I'm trying to focus on, in the Portland metropolitan area conducted by a group called Most—M.O.S.T., it's the Monthly Oregon Survey Trend that they do. That also showed only 14 percent were in favor of Federal intervention as a means to manage the gorge.

The message here that's relevant to tourism is that perhaps the imposition of Federal designation without the full support of the people in this area may produce reactions that are counterproductive to the development of a hospitable environment for a tourism program in this area. At this point, it doesn't appear that everyone is sold on the idea. I think they're much more likely to buy into the tourism development if they're allowed to have a large part, if not allowed to control their own destiny, in this particular direction.

Another potential adverse effect on tourism arising out of the proposed legislation is the restrictions on development. Limiting growth to urban growth boundaries may not always be in the best interests of developing the essential facilities to support a tourism industry. That essentially, as I recall from the previous legislation, was where growth was limited. The exempted areas were basically urban growth boundaries.

Some types of facilities might actually fit better into other areas, and I'll point to a couple of examples. For instance, if central Oregon and the coast had had that attitude a few years ago, we wouldn't have a Salishan, a Black Butte, or a Sun River.

Looking at the other very important side of the economic——

The CHAIRMAN. Say that again. If they'd had what attitude, you wouldn't have had a Salishan?

Mr. HEMINGWAY. If they'd had the kind of restrictions that would preclude development outside of urban growth boundaries, then we would not have those areas. I can point to Kah-Nee-Ta as another area I doubt anyone would have ever labeled as an urban growth boundary unless something had generated from within.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you account for the rather extensive expansion of Salishan, then, after the passage of the Oregon beach bill?

Mr. HEMINGWAY. Well, at that point I guess it became a designated urban growth boundary, and I assume there are mechanisms to allow that kind of expansion to occur. I'm saying it's a basic inhibitor in the beginning. For that to happen, you have to sell the idea, and those things may never have occurred.

The **Chairman**. So the fact that you have, in essence, a zoning control outside the control of the people who live there doesn't necessarily inhibit the economic growth of the area?

Mr. **Hemingway**. Well, I guess the point I'm really trying to say is that we have the situation now with local zoning, and that sort of thing. But, if we had to go through a much more extensive layer of government, as it were, to allow that to happen, I think it would be very—it would be much more inhibitive of that kind of growth. I guess that's the point I'm trying to make here.

Looking at the other very important side of the economic coin, it's hard to see how Federal designation will have any positive impact on the expansion of traditional business and industry in the Mid-Columbia, which we badly need. I'll point out here very quickly that one area that has been mentioned already, the Dallesport area, most studies—and we just did a major research project on the Mid-Columbia for our marketing group—a review of those past studies shows the Dalles—the Dallesport area is going to be, or all indications indicate that that is going to be, the major area of growth. Past legislation did not exclude that area from—the Dallesport area in particular would not be excluded from the control or—I'm not saying this well. The Dallesport area was an area that would not be allowed to grow as it was, presently zoned and configured.

In summary, let me say that those of us who live in the gorge and the Mid-Columbia are concerned about our future. It is a unique, yes, but well-established multiple-use area. We believe it must stay that way in order to remain economically viable. In order to live here, we have to make a living. The area has tremendous potential; it is vast and varied, with the capacity to conduct a wide range of activities. Tourism development is one of these options, but it's not a panacea. We have to provide a diversified base for jobs development and retention. We believe we have both the will and the tools in place with which to coordinate a variety of compatible activities effectively. We believe we ought to have more say-so in how we handle our lives and control our surroundings than well-intended but less-affected outsiders.

Those of us who live here are vitally concerned about the preservation of the area. We believe we have generally done a responsible job up to this point, and can do an even better job in the future.

We are willing to cooperate with the Federal Government, States, or any other group to this end. But, we don't want to be dominated by them.

Mid-Columbia Marketing is a group spawned from the area to help address our most pressing problem, which I mentioned a minute ago, and that is the economy of the area. Even at this point, and we're only 6 or 7 months old, it's a pretty fair example of how local people can come together from within to regionally address a regional problem.

We certainly aren't above receiving good advice or any other well-meaning assistance. But, we want to retain the lead in solving our own problems. I believe Mid-Columbia Marketing's philosophy is reflective of how the people in this area feel about maintaining control over their own destiny. Federal designation of the Columbia River Gorge does not seem consistent with that philosophy.

Before closing, I've been told I could take a couple of minutes and put on my other hat for a minute and talk a little bit about ports.

I think it's pretty common knowledge that ports are charged by statute to look after local economic development and job requirements. It should be noted that throughout the Mid-Columbia area that there are ports which have been involved in operations that have been confined to logical locations and generally fit the environment and their surroundings. Our activities are carried out under an approved master plan reflective of the desires of the communities they represent.

Tourism is one of the areas of economic expansion that ports have recognized and responded to. Virtually every port in the Mid-Columbia area already has some facilities in place to support recreation and tourism. All five ports have a marina and/or docking facilities. One provides a public golf course. One houses a very attractive visitor center and museum. Another has a national historic designation for its visitor facilities. Two ports are involved in the operation of one of the most successful tourism enterprises in the gorge, and that's the tourboat *Columbia Sightseer.* All ports have future plans for facilities to support an expanded tourist industry in the gorge. One port, Cascade Locks, has already made a significant $3 million commitment to the construction of a 350-passenger replica sternwheeler. Many of us think this boat may well be the catalyst that really gets the development of a viable visitor industry in the Mid-Columbia area going.

All these things came about not by chance, again, but were the result of conscious decisions of port commissions responsive to what was going on around them. There was serious deliberation, consideration, and cooperation with other appropriate agencies, governing bodies, private industry, and the general support of people in their port districts.

We believe the ports have played an important part in the developing economy of the gorge. We want to continue to be able to meet our responsibilities in this area, and it is our opinion that Federal designation will not enhance our capabilities, and is not in the best interests of ports.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. Carpenito.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON. Mr. Packwood, could you have the speakers speak a little louder or get closer to the microphones?

The CHAIRMAN. Sure. We'll do the best we can. How many live microphones do we have? Is that one in front of you working? Speak into it.

Mr. CARPENITO. Hello.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. Pull it up a little bit and tilt it up. Talk right into it.

Thank you very much, I appreciate it.

Mr. CARPENITO. Thank you, Senator.

I represent Columbia Gorge United. I am the president of Columbia Gorge United. I've been sitting here trying to figure out what I'm doing here. I looked over the list and I think I found out, after reviewing the list. I guess Columbia Gorge United would be the token representatives of the people of the gorge, since on the agenda, as far as I can see, we are the only organization that is strictly formed of volunteers, of citizens throughout the gorge.

So, I'm proud to say I'm here representing these people, and on their behalf, according to the information presented to us so far, I probably represent about 90 percent of the people of the gorge when it comes to their opinion of what should happen to the gorge.

I'd like to make a statement first as to what Columbia Gorge United really is. Back in November a group of us got together on both sides of the river and started reviewing what had happened to other organizations in the past. We decided it would be good to form an umbrella organization with one major theme, and we only have one major theme, and that is to oppose Federal control.

We have a board of directors of 13, and we have representatives from each county in the gorge. Our membership is growing, and we're proceeding along good lines. We must be doing something right because, like I said, we are on the agenda.

I have given your staff a backup package. In that backup package we have most of what my testimony will talk about. I'd like to skip over my testimony, because most of those comments have been made.

I think one thing will be obvious: after the hearing this morning that the Columbia Gorge has not only scenic value, but strong economic value to the community. So, I do not want to prolong that.

However, I think it's time that we talk about some other issues. In the past, only one side of the gorge issue was being heard. For approximately 2 years there were a few people traveling up and down the gorge and in the metropolitan area talking about preservation of the gorge. However, what finally has turned out is to find out that when they said "preservation" they really meant Federal control of the gorge.

Once people became aware of that, survey polls were taken. The gentleman to my left here has talked about some of those polls and taken a little bit of my talk on some of those polls. But, I think an interesting point is that if you read our documentation file, we have copies of the polls in there, especially the one in the Portland metropolitan area. You will see that not only the citizens but a lot of the local officials up and down the gorge, oppose Federal control of the gorge; and specifically, they're talking about S. 2318 and S. 2319.

However, it was my understanding today we will not hit those bills, we'd hit the idea of tourism and commerce in the gorge. But, before we can talk about tourism and commerce, we've got to know about the people in the gorge.

Up and down the gorge I've heard, and this morning I've heard the same thing, that there are no local tools to regulate growth on either side of the gorge. That's totally incorrect. I'm a real estate broker. I have dealt with land development for 10 years. I probably have, outside of yourself, Senator, and some staff people, and maybe a few other representatives in the room, I have read more land use laws, textbooks, and have studied these quite extensively.

Let's set the record straight. Both Washington and Oregon have in place several tools. Both are using some form of the enabling acts. Both are using subdivision laws. Both have shoreline management. Both have statewide health codes. All the counties I know of are living up to some type of building codes.

Without a doubt, I can say right now that if you go into most of the counties, and especially on the Oregon side, you will find no free hand, to use a cliche, of raping the land taking place. In fact, I own no property in the Columbia Gorge. I have sold one or two pieces in the past. Everytime I've gone to local officials in Skamania County and talked to them about development, I find that they understand far better what property is and the use of property than a lot of the metropolitan areas.

This brings me to another point. If we have these type of controls in place, why do some people want to see Federal control? Federal control of the gorge will remove the right of local citizens to regulate their own communities. It will place their future in the hands of powerful lobbyists in Washington, D.C.

If you look at the environmental groups who are the proponents of Federal control, you will see they have budgets exceeding $16 million. That's only four of the groups and they are considered some of the most powerful lobbyists in Washington, D.C.

In fact, it was interesting, after the Vancouver city council hearings I made some inquiries in Washington, D.C., about some of the groups, and they told me how big the battle would be to allow the local citizens to control their own community. In fact, they said on a scale of 1 to 10 the people of the gorge are down the tubes before you begin.

Once these groups gain Federal control, they will direct the future of the gorge, not the local citizens.

Finally, both Oregon and Washington have active programs to promote tourism, as we've heard today. In addition, groups like the chamber and the Mid-Columbia Marketing group are focusing on tourism. Local businesses are focusing on tourism.

Both States have a historic register act, which allows local communities to preserve structures and assist tourism.

There is much more we can say about this issue, and you'll find other points in our backup package.

No, I think it really comes down to this, as far as our group is concerned. We'd like to leave you with some thoughts. There are over 41,000 people living in the gorge. I made a telephone call to some people that had supported S. 2318 and 2319 in the past, and they were shocked to find out there was 41,000 people living in the gorge. They thought the gorge was nothing but wilderness, that there were not communities there, that there were not people there. Of course, the other side has done their job well.

These 41,000 people came to the gorge to build their homes, to start their businesses, to raise their families, and to regulate themselves. I can tell you they love their communities and they love the land. Those of us who have heard their voice believe in their right to govern themselves. We believe that they understand what the gorge means to all of us, and we will continue to carry their message to the nation.

We all recognize that further Federal control in the gorge will not—will not—as far as I have seen in any documents—eliminate one single government agency. It will only add another level of bureaucracy.

More Federal ownership of the gorge means less private ownership. More Federal ownership of private lands means more cost to the taxpayers.

We urge you to let the citizens of the gorge continue to do what they have done so well in the past—govern themselves.

I have heard some comments previous to my point here talking about shipyards, and stuff. Well, I'm a traveler, like everybody. If you go to Boston, they have tours of nothing but traveling through the shipyards, seeing the shipyards. So, industry probably will not hurt the gorge for tourism.

Some of the most attractive things I've seen are watching some of the industries at work.

Then I've heard comments about multipliers for tourism. Folks, one of the best multipliers there are, as the Senator is aware of, is the multiplier used in the building of homes. In fact, I'm not sure what the multiplier is today, but in the past it's been as large as a 4 to 6 multiplier per income generated in the community.

I have heard people talk about the zoning issue, and I'd like to leave a comment on that. I'm not here today to argue about zoning, but I'd love to get into that discussion anytime. Because the truth of the fact is zoning has nothing to do with land use regulation. Zoning has to do with people control.

The first zoning act was done in New York City in approximately 1916. It was done for one purpose, to regulate the Orientals within the business community, to keep them out of certain neighborhoods. That's a fact of law.

Let's not talk about zoning, let's talk about the people. I urge you to consider first local control and let the people of the gorge continue to do what they've done best. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

[The statement follows:]

STATEMENT OF JIM CARPENITO, PRESIDENT, COLUMBIA GORGE UNITED

Our organization appreciates this opportunity to present this testimony and documentation on the Columbia Gorge issue. Columbia Gorge United—People Opposing Federal Control grew out of a consensus among citizens in both Washington and Oregon. Columbia Gorge United's elected Board of Directors includes residents from all six counties which would be affected by the proposed national scenic area. Our membership now includes groups and individual throughout the Gorge and the Portland-Vancouver metropolitan area. We understand that today's hearing is to focus on commerce and tourism in the Gorge. However, in order to do that one must understand that the Columbia River Gorge is an area of infinite variety. It is not only the scenic beauty that goes with the lush forest, sagebrush desert, and towering cliffs, but also the many uses of the Gorge itself that give it this variety.

The Gorge contains approximately 41,000 local inhabitants, three major hydroelectric dams with navigation locks for extensive barge traffic, 82 miles of major interstate highway on one side of the Columbia River, 83 miles of state highway on the other side of the river, a minimum of 115 miles of county roads, 24 miles of designated scenic highway, 50 miles of logging roads, 220 miles of power and gas transmission lines, 170 miles of two major mainline railroads, 5 sawmills, 2 plywood plants, and 2 chip plants, 2 aluminum reduction plants, one wood products treatment plant, 8 incorporated cities and 15 unincorporated cities, 44 private, state and federal parks and recreational facilities, orchards, farmland, intensively managed small and industrial woodlands, 4 bridge crossings of the Columbia River, 5 fish hatcheries, 6 Port Districts, 24 miles of walking trails, including a natural scenic trail, 2 forest service scenic areas and one wilderness area. As you can see the Gorge is not only a scenic area but a major economic transportation corridor.

In the past only one side of the Gorge issue was being heard. Today people are asking why federal control over more private property in the Gorge? Why can't tourism be promoted with federal intervention? We would like to point out the following facts:

First, is the support for federal control as strong as the proponents claim. Not according to the data we have compiled.

1. Skamania County—November 3, 1981, 87 percent voted against federal control
2. Cascade Locks area—July, 1982, 96.8 percent oppose federal government
3. Portland Metropolitan area—October, 1982, Independent survey conducted by Moore Information, Inc. showed 65 percent opposed federal management

Plus many others have gone on official notice in opposition to federal control (please see back-up package).

Next, the proponents of federal control say that the local governments have no tools to control growth. This is totally false. Washington and Oregon have in place and are using the following:

1. Planning Enabling Acts
2. Subdivision Laws
3. Shoreline Management
4. Statewide Health Codes

Plus, there are local building and planning regulations. What supporters of federal control mean is "they want their lobbyist to have control." This brings us to point Number Three.

Federal control of the Gorge will remove the right of local citizens to regulate their own communities. It will place their future in the hands of powerful lobbyists in Washington, D.C. If you look at the proponents of federal control you will see they have budgets exceeding Seventeen Million Dollars. They are considered some of the most powerful lobbyist in Washington, D.C. Once they gain federal control they will direct the future of the Gorge not the local citizens. Finally, both Oregon and Washington have active programs to promote tourism. In addition, groups like the Chamber of Commerce and Mid Columbia Marketing are focusing on tourism in the Gorge. Plus local businesses will contiunue to promote tourism to expand their economic base. Both States have adopted Historic Register Acts which also allow local communities to preserve structures and assist tourism. There is much more we could say on this issue. You will find other points in our back-up package. We would like to leave you with some thoughts. There are over 41,000 people living in the Gorge. They came to the Gorge to build their homes, start their businesses, raise their families and regulate themselves. They love their communities and the land. Those of us who have heard their voice believe in their right to govern themselves. We believe they understand what the Gorge means to all of us. We will continue to carry their message to the Nation.

We must all recognize that further federal control in the Gorge will not eliminate one single government agency. it will only add another level of bureaucracy. More federal ownership of the Gorge means less private ownership. More federal ownership of private lands means more cost to the taxpayers. We urge you to let the citizens of the Gorge continue to do what they have done so well in the past—govern themselves.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Commissioner Benson.

Mr. **BENSON**. Thank you, Senator.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The people in back may not be able to hear you, so get a microphone that's live and speak right into it.

Mr. **BENSON**. We in Skamania County have been accused of being backward hillbillies, if you will. The experience here certainly shows that we are naive. We were told and believed that this would deal with commerce. I have heard regional, bistate, and the L.C.D.C. discussed here as it would control Skamania County. I think that's a far cry from commerce.

In spite of the fact Skamania County would be the area most critically affected by any gorge legislation, it was not until yesterday that any elected official from Skamania County was afforded the opportunity to testify at this hearing. Indeed, without the help of Senator Jackson, I would not be here today.

Much of the private property within the gorge boundaries is located within Skamania County. We feel that tourism is only one factor in the future of the gorge. Any proposed legislation could have other negative effects that could far outweigh the benefits of tourism.

These negative effects include the loss of local control and individual property rights. The persons allowed to speak at this hearing do not fully represent those who will be directly affected by changes in the economic base and land management regulation; and, in fact, most live out of the area and are proponents of Federal management of the gorge.

I might add that the large preponderance of these people are, indeed, tourists themselves. Ninety percent of the people who live in Skamania County voted in our last election to retain local control and opposed any form of Federal control.

For these reasons, I go on record as adamantly opposing this hearing as representing any kind of an open, public hearing that reflects the wishes of the people of the area.

Skamania County, in conjunction with Klickitat and Clark Counties, has signed an interlocal agreement to develop a plan and guidelines for the Washington side of the gorge. We feel we can provide for tourism and other economic activities, while preserving the natural and scenic qualities of the gorge.

Skamania County, incidentally, was the first county to have their shoreline management plan approved. We led the whole State in that.

We want hearings scheduled in the gorge that not only assess the effects of tourism on the gorge, but also the overall effect of any management proposal. We want an opportunity for all members of the public to speak before a Senate Committee without content censorship. We want those hearings to be held in an area that is accessible to the public affected—that is, in Skamania County, in Washington State, or in Oregon, but not in Washington, D.C. Thank you.

The **Chairman**. Let me say again, commissioner one of the reasons the hearings are somewhat limited is that the Commerce Committee will not have jurisdiction over a gorge bill if it's introduced. I have jurisdiction over some commerce, some tourism, and that is a fair portion of what this hearing is on. If the bill is introduced it will go to a committee chaired by Senator McClure of Idaho, the Energy Committee, and that is one of the reasons why I'm not quite at liberty to throw it open and do just anything. We try to observe each other's jurisdiction, as you do in your local government.

But, short of that, as I indicated we had over 200 requests to testify. It was very clear that much of it would have been repetitive. I'm not sure there are 200 different viewpoints.

There will be other hearings, and others will get to testify, and maybe some of you will testify again. I can assure you of that.

Let me ask you this, commissioner; do people who live outside the gorge have any right at all to say how the gorge is managed?

Mr. **Benson**. How far outside? Where do you draw the line? I mean——

The **Chairman**. Well, let's just go anywhere. Seattle?

Mr. **Benson**. No.

The **Chairman**. They don't?

Mr. **Benson**. We don't interfere in their Puget Sound or Lake Washington.

The **Chairman**. Portland?

Mr. **Benson**. No.

The **Chairman**. No right?

Mr. **Benson**. No.

The **Chairman**. Vancouver?

Mr. **Benson**. No. Well, just their 2 miles that are within the gorge.

The **Chairman**. In other words, only those who actually live in the gorge have any right to say how it should be managed?

Mr. **Benson**. As it pertains to their property rights and their rights as citizens in this country, yes.

The **Chairman**. All right. Now, let me ask you this. We have voted a number of times, and may again, on the expansion of the Redwoods National Park. Should the Federal Government be involved in that at all, or should only local people decide whether or not the redwoods are cut or saved?

Mr. **Benson**. I would say, regarding the redwoods, the Sierra Club is so strong down there that I'm sure they will protect them through State legislation.

The **Chairman**. You know, that's an interesting answer because you mentioned State legislation, and yet that would be passed by an overwhelming bulk of people who live outside the area of the redwoods.

Should the redwoods be left to the management just of the people who live around them?

Mr. **Benson**. It would be to their advantage to manage them properly.

The **Chairman**. Well, my question is—and this is really a philosophical question involving Government—does the Federal Government have any right, duty or obligation to set up national parks? Clearly people from all over the country are voting on setting up parks and wilderness areas in regions they don't represent.

Mr. **Benson**. If those parks are set up on Federal land, either Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, whatever, they do have the right. They don't have the right to come in, take people's homes away from them, take their land over; or, if they leave them there, tell them how they can carry on their day-to-day lives. No.

The **Chairman**. So, in essence, we had no right to create a fair portion of the Redwoods National Park which was created by purchase from some of the timber companies, and in some cases by condemnation?

Mr. **Benson**. If you had a willing buyer and a willing seller, yes, but not with condemnation.

The **Chairman**. So, I want to come back again; Portland has no say in the management of the gorge, and Vancouver has no say except for, what did you say, the 2 miles of Clark County that are in the gorge?

Mr. **Benson**. Right.

The **Chairman**. But Vancouver, none.

Mr. **Benson**. No.

The **Chairman**. All right.

Mr. **Benson**. Well, wait a minute, Senator. On this group I mentioned, this agreement we signed with Clark and Klickitat Counties, we are endeavoring through this group to form some reasonable guidelines for the preservation and the management of the Washington side. They won't be a management body, per se, they will be an overseeing body, as I see it, much as the Shorelines Act is.

Each individual county will have its own land use plan, its own zoning. They will be reviewed by this committee. If, after the plans are approved, if the commissioners give a variance where they shouldn't or don't give a variance where they should, then this oversight body is a board of appeals between the local county officials and the courts.

The **Chairman**. But it's a court of appeals, as I understand it from what you just said, from the zoning rules in each particular county?

Mr. **Benson**. That's right.

The **Chairman**. So the appeal is: Did you follow the zoning requirements of that county?

Mr. **Benson**. Right.

The **Chairman**. It is not in any sense a tri-county land conservation and development commission, as Oregon knows that term?

Mr. **Benson**. Well, Senator, I keep hearing this L.C.D.C. If it is so successful, why is it being challenged in almost every county court in this State?

The **Chairman**. It's been on the ballot three times in Oregon and the people on each occasion have kept it. They've voted to keep it so they're apparently satisfied with it.

But I'm trying to find out what your intercounty zoning board is and what its powers are. It has no powers, I take it, to pass zoning legislation that affects all of the counties?

Mr. **Benson**. It would take State legislation. That's what we are working toward.

The **Chairman**. So, basically, it's a board that you can appeal to about whether Skamania County followed the procedures and the laws of Skamania County?

Mr. **Benson**. Right.

The **Chairman**. OK, now, I want to come back again because your basic position is that people who live outside the area have no rightful concern as to how those who live in the area manage it?

Mr. **Benson**. That's right.

The **Chairman**. OK.

Mr. **Benson**. When your bill was passed in Oregon, the coast bill——

The **Chairman**. Uh huh.

Mr. **Benson** [continuing]. At the time, I was living in Newport, Oreg. I had five lots, and mean low water of the Pacific Ocean was my western boundary. Those lots were cut in half by your bill to save that.

The **Chairman**. You, I take it very clearly, were opposed to the Oregon beach bill?

Mr. **Benson**. Certainly.

The **Chairman**. Again, under any circumstances there is no right of anybody in Seattle, Portland, or the city of Vancouver—because they're not in the gorge—to have concern or input as to how Skamania County or the other counties choose to manage their portion of the gorge?

Mr. BENSON. We would welcome any suggestions or guidance. But, as far as anybody having a firm voice in the management of our affairs, no.

The CHAIRMAN. That is basically the attitude you would take generally about Federal parks, Federal scenic areas, anything; that unless they can be created on what is now Federal land, or unless a willing seller wants to sell, we should not and never should have created any Federal parks, recreation areas, or scenic areas?

Mr. BENSON. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Well, it's a very clear position.

I would say this. I would hate to think where we would be when we started the national park system if we had said no national park will be created if those who are living adjacent to it are opposed. I think we would have no national park system.

Mr. BENSON. Senator, we have one of the greatest park systems, the greatest national forests, in the world. I mean the one. Don't you think we have enough?

The CHAIRMAN. I'm just saying they never would have been created at all. My experience in almost every situation—it was true with Hells Canyon, true with French Pete, true with the Cascade Head scenic research area, and you may be familiar with the Cascade Head area having lived in Newport—none of them would have been created if the decision had been left solely to those who live closest to it. I think your answer would be, therefore, that they shouldn't be created.

Mr. BENSON. No; they shouldn't be.

The CHAIRMAN. OK, I have no more questions.

We need to take about a 10-minute break and then we'll come back with the next panel. Thank you, gentlemen.

[Recess.]

The CHAIRMAN. The hearing will come to order, please.

If those who want to stay would come in and those who want to converse would go outside we'd appreciate it. The fire marshal has indicated that we will have to shut the hearings down altogether if you block the exits. So unless you take seats, or else go outside nobody's going to get to testify and the fire marshal is going to preside.

Our next panel is Dennis Buchanan, the county executive for Multnomah County; Eric Hovee, the economic development manager from the city of Vancouver; and Mr. James Burke of Pacific Economica.

Chairman Buchanan?

STATEMENTS OF DENNIS BUCHANAN, COUNTY EXECUTIVE, MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREG.; ERIC HOVEE, MANAGER, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, CITY OF VANCOUVER, WASH.; AND JAMES BURKE, SENIOR ECONOMIST, PACIFIC ECONOMICA

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman and members of the panel, I appreciate, too, the opportunity to appear here today. I am Dennis Buchanan, Multnomah County executive, and a past member of the Board of County Commissioners for 7 years. I'm here first to convey the county's firm position in support of a national scenic area. The board voted four to one in a resolution supporting that measure after a series of public hearings.

The county feels very simply that a national scenic area is the only means of providing a total management program for the gorge, and I want to emphasize total, recognizing preservation as well as the need for the communities to flourish economically.

I want to say at the outset that I feel that Multnomah County and the citizens of Multnomah County do and should have a voice in the future development of the gorge. First, our boundaries extend to east of Cascade locks. Second, many of the lands in the gorge are federally and State owned, so I think we have a voice in that. Third, the future development of the gorge is essential to our economy because of its vital role in tourism and attracting conventions to our region.

I think we all appreciate the problem we have in managing the gorge. First, the gorge itself is an interstate feature, with two States having a voice in what happens there. Six counties are involved, ten cities, seven port districts, and an array of unincorporated area, service districts, Federal and State agencies.

I think when we look at the ingredients that are necessary to preserve the gorge, we can see that only a Federal answer will work. What are those ingredients?

They are, first, staff to develop a plan. Two, a staff to implement a plan, and carry it on in an on-going basis. Third, money to buy scenic easements and acquire property that is necessary to preserve the scenic beauty of the gorge and its economic benefits to this region.

I think only the Federal agency spans two States. I think only a Federal agency can coordinate all the different units involved. Certainly only a Federal agency has the money to do the job.

Do you think you're going to get the money from the State of Oregon? Its current debt is $600 million. The legislature is now trying to deal with a deficit of $600 million.

Washington is even worse off. Not only that, Washington's interest is much less in the gorge than the State of Oregon's, mainly because of the way population is distributed; with the emphasis being in the Puget Sound area in Washington, and in the Portland area in Oregon.

I don't think you're going to get it from the counties. Multnomah County has a $14 million deficit that we have to cut from an $85 million budget. The money isn't there.

So, the States don't have it, the counties don't have it, and I suspect the cities in this area are facing the same kind of problems.

The CHAIRMAN. Fortunately we only have a $190 billion deficit at the Federal level.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I'm getting to the Federal Government, don't worry. You're not going to get away. Now I've lost my place here.

Yes, we have to deal with your priorities, too, Senator. I mean, instead of shipping money off to El Salvador, and places like that, I think if we can achieve things in the past like preservation of Yosemite and Crater Lake and Glacier National Park and the Sawtooth and the Santa Monica Mountain National Scenic Area, the

Federal Government can reorder its priorities, balance its budget, deal with its deficit, and find moneys to manage the gorge.

So, I think when we look at local control we have to ask whether or not those people who want local control really should have to bear the burden of paying for the staff, of carrying out the plan, and of acquiring lands and scenic easements that are necessary for preservation. I don't think that's fair to the people in the local area to have to do that.

Let me make a second comment, and you've already alluded to this in comments before the break, about the Federal approach versus a local approach. I think Oregonians, as you've pointed out, support this kind of approach to preserving vital scenic areas. As you noted, three times they have voted for State land use planning. Three times groups agitated against State land use planning on the grounds of local control, and the Oregonians have gone to the polls and they have consistently refused to buy this argument for State land use planning.

Why? They dealt with the realities. They weren't satisfied with the way things were going without State land use planning and so-called local control. I think Oregonians recognize that so often the local control is more by special interest, and the citizens and their needs are ignored by local politicians who cave in to them.

So, I think that when you look at the essential ingredients, the only solution to this is a national scenic area, and we strongly support that. We feel that, like our State land use planning, the Federal Government can take a balanced approach. I know that under State land use planning it has been an economic boon rather than a problem for the county. As a matter of fact, State land use planning required us to identify our economic goals, and as a result we tripled the amount of land available for State land use planning. It had a helpful effect rather than a negative effect.

I think we all recognize that the problems of economic development in Oregon are not related to State land use planning. We have had studies by Stanford Research Institute, we've had studies by the State, and they are now identifying the principal problem as a general negative attitude, and second, the tax structure of the State.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by "general negative attitude"? What does that mean?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I think that the primary problem in the State of Oregon has been recognized as our tax structure. Generally, there has not been a conscious effort on the part of the State and local governments to recognize the importance of attracting new development and working for it as effectively as they could.

I think there is certainly a perception that Oregon does not welcome business, and I think that's a misconception; but, that has been a problem. I certainly think that is changing.

But, the primary cause is not land use planning, it's the tax structure of the State. I think probably our foremost expert on that—at least I recognize him as that—is John Gray, who wrote in the Portland magazine that he felt that the State land use planning laws in Oregon have not dissuaded one single business from relocating here.

So, I would urge you to proceed with the adoption of this legislation as being in the best interests of the people of Multnomah County, as being in the best interests of the people of this region including the people of the gorge.

The CHAIRMAN. Dennis, let me ask you, because yours is one of the counties that is literally part of the gorge, from your experience in dealing with the other gorge counties do you think it is likely that you will all get together and reach a common concensus on a management format?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I think it is totally impossible, and I think that's been demonstrated already. The fact is, and I want to go back to our budget deficit, we're looking at a $14 million deficit, and there are going to be severe cutbacks in land use planning. There's not going to be the staff to even do it. We're not even going to get through this budget with the staff we need to address minimum needs. I suggest the same thing is probably happening in other counties and cities in the area.

So, we're very limited. Even if we got together, could we sustain the program? Are we going to pour the resources necessary to do it into it? What about carrying out the plan? What about paying for acquisitions and scenic easements? It's out of the question.

The CHAIRMAN. Second question: Local politicians, I find, are pretty good about being in touch with what their people think. You're reasonably convinced that the citizens of Multnomah County want some kind of gorge protection, and if necessary the Federal Government taking the lead?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I'm convinced of that. But, I'm basing that on the statewide vote that has been supported again and again in Oregon, three times this measure was supported; and, I think strongly by the people in the State, including Multnomah County. So, I think they accept and approve this kind of approach. I think they see that with the pressures that are developing it's just not going to happen.

The CHAIRMAN. The reason I ask is that we often hear these polling results showing that the people oppose Federal control. I've not seen the question asked, although I've dealt with polls long enough to realize that you should be very wary of the results unless you know who was sampled and what the question was.

My hunch would be if you were to say to almost anybody, "Do you want Federal control of," you'd get a very high "no" response, and it wouldn't matter what the question was.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Except wars. They're pretty good at that. I don't think anybody has advocated local control for that. And I think in dealing with interstate preservation problems, and I think there—and I know it's popular to attack the Federal Government, but I think that we shouldn't overgeneralize. I think the main problems I have are the overregulation, the Federal deficit, and all that. But, I think when you look at the Federal record in dealing with national scenic areas, it's one we're all proud of. When you look at what's happened at Yosemite, when you look at what's happened at Yellowstone and Glacier, I think we're proud of the Federal Government's record in that area. It's something that we all approve.

When we look at the Sawtooth National Recreation Area, and your own efforts in Hells Canyon, and the Upper Delaware River, which covers three States, we find out that you need a solution that's as large as the problem. To try to do anything less, it simply isn't going to work.

So, I recognize the public attitude toward the Federal Government now, but I think that we should be careful and not overgeneralize about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

[The statement follows:]

STATEMENT OF DENNIS BUCHANAN, COUNTY EXECUTIVE, MULTNOMAH COUNTY

Mr. Chairman and members of the board—I am Dennis Buchanan, recently elected Multnomah County Executive and a past member of the Board of County Commissioners for seven years. I am here to convey the County's firm position in favor of the National Scenic Area plan as a means of providing a total management program for the Columbia River Gorge.

Given the premise that preservation of the Gorge is a desirable goal for both present and future generations, by what means can we establish a caretaker organization to ensure protection of the scenic and historic treasures of the Gorge?

Through a compact or consortium of local governments? No, because they have neither the financial nor staff resources and most don't have the authority to enter into interstate agreements of this sort.

How about the states involved? Hardly likely on that score, either. The states of Oregon and Washington are currently looking at balancing budgets with deficits already running at a combined total in the billions of dollars.

That leaves the federal government. The federal government provides the only option available to us to get this program rolling. It's the only public agency which has jurisdiction on both sides of the river for the entire length of the Gorge, the mechanism for funding such a program and the staff knowledge and assistance to help with the development stages.

So, I would preface my remarks by emphasizing that our only avenue of recourse is through the federal government and to restate that this program is a very vital concern for Multnomah County residents.

Although a fairly large portion of the Gorge in Multnomah County is already in public ownership, one doesn't have to look to other counties to see a number of issues of concern. Within Multnomah County, one begins to see the pronounced affects of parcelized, private land ownership. It is easy to look at a forested hillside in the Gorge and only see the trees. A look at a property map for that same area reveals a picture of fractionated ownerships. The development of parcelized land can be either slow or rapid, but it is happening none the less. If Oregon—with its strict land use planning program requiring local plans and conforming zoning—has problems protecting the Gorge, how much more critical can this problem be on Washington's side, where plans and zoning are not even required?

Multnomah County is also the location of one other problem which needs a concerted effort to solve. A large number of State parks—which receive thousands of visitors each year—are located in this County. Overuse of these parks has created severe parking problems, damage to vegetation, and crowd control problems. The Gorge is the closest place for thousands of metropolitan residents for recreation and most of them visit the Oregon State Parks, because they are the only areas accessible to them in the Gorge. The Gorge is an ideal recreational resource, but designated recreational areas are limited, particularly in Washington. With I-205 offering access from eastern Clark County to Oregon parks, impacts from overuse will be even greater.

Multnomah County illustrates the creeping urbanization process taking place throughout the Gorge. Year by year, more land is divided and sold into multiple ownerships, more homes built, more businesses formed. No one commercial or residential development can be accused of scenic destruction, but the cumulative impact is being felt. It is this last point which leads me to the most serious problem facing the Gorge today and in which my County has a stake.

That problem is the multiplicity of jurisdictions within the Gorge. Two separate States create obstacles for integrated management, each State with its own set of laws, practices and standards. Now, place in this bi-State river valley six counties, 10 incorporated cities, several unincorporated communities, seven port districts and numerous other service districts. Then add state agencies, Indian tribes, and federal agencies, including three major land management agencies. Creation of two separate Gorge Commissions to achieve an integrated management plan is evidence that lack of coordination is the problem. The solution is difficult.

It is the manner in which decisions are made in the Gorge which causes legitimate concern. The issue here is one of scale. The Columbia Gorge is an integrated unit and it needs to be treated as such. Each and every land use decision, plan formulation, and resource use has an impact and decision which can not continue to be made in a vacuum or piecemeal basis.

The Gorge needs a solution which addresses the inter-jurisdictional issue but still allows all affected parties a role in the process. I would like to see a Columbia Gorge which has joint management to regulate land use with common goals and standards, with coordinated recreation planning, lands which preserves the Gorge's natural balances, and where growth areas are recognized and set aside for that purpose.

The only way for this to happen is through federal legislation that assists the states and all other jurisdictions. Everyone agrees that the Gorge is a special place. Its unique character should be protected for the future. Disagreement comes in designing a solution to achieve that goal. If I felt that the management structure we had today was working, I wouldn't advocate a change.

I am asking for federal assistance in this effort—not to solve the problems of Multnomah County or to force other jurisdictions to accept regulations they have no part in—but to bring diverse factions together toward a more integrated process. I see the National Scenic Area concept as a tool which can be beneficial in the future management of the Columbia Gorge.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Next, we'll take Mr. Hovee.

Mr. HOVEE. Senator Packwood, I appreciate the chance to share my thoughts as a development professional and Vancouver resident for the tourism potential of the Columbia River Gorge. I'm employed as Economic Development Manager for the city of Vancouver, Wash.

In the written testimony, I have submitted a working paper that's entitled "Enhancemant of the Columbia River Gorge" which was completed in August 1982. This report was prepared for the Friends of the Gorge by Elizabeth Lyon, who's an urban consultant, and it represents a voluntary work effort to compile information from existing statistical sources, about 19 personal interviews, and eight prior research studies that have taken place in the last few years; all of which examine the tourist potential of communities located within the gorge.

I'd like to share with you some of the conclusions that have emerged from this work, together with some overall observations that I have on the opportunities for tourism development in the Columbia River Gorge.

First, as has been testified to earlier, there are already a tremendous number of people visiting the gorge. In 1981, for example, more than 2 million people visited the area's two best-known attractions, Bonneville Dam and Multnomah Falls. Even more amazingly, visits to these two attractions are growing rapidly as they've increased by about 70 percent in just the past 4 years.

The United States travel data center has calculated the job effect of tourism in the Columbia River Gorge counties. On the Oregon side, for example, tourism accounts for anywhere from 3 to 12 percent of—well, workers in 3 to 12 percent of the total population in the gorge counties.

The importance, of course, of keeping and building the visitor trade is especially evident in counties like Skamania, Klickitat, and Hood River, where unemployment has been running at rates of 20 percent or more. As the national economy improves, I think it is widely acknowledged that employment in forest products, which has been an economic mainstay in the region, will never again rise to the levels of previous years.

A second conclusion is that the tourism potential of the gorge has only begun to be realized. This is largely because promotion and development efforts, until recently, have been fairly fragmented. While the two major public attractions draw more that two million visitors annually, private commercial ventures have fared much less well. A 1976 study of resort development potential in the Mid-Columbia Gorge showed that Maryhill Museum had only 78,000 visitors. During the same year, the Dalles Dam train tour drew about 40,000. The Cascade Locks boat tour had only 10,000 passengers although it did increase to 30,000 by 1981.

Because of inadequate local lodging accomodations and the fact that people stay generally only 1 or 2 days, if that, within the gorge, and fairly low utilization of commercial attractions, it is easy to see that there are some significant opportunities for local economic development that are now being missed.

I think there are a number of reasons to help explain why the area's attractions are not being more evenly utilized. For example, there are no staffed visitor information centers at either end of the gorge. Highway signing, even for attractions as significant as the visitor center and fish ladder at Bonneville, are not adequate. While there are a variety of local brochures on specific attractions, there has not been a single brochure promoting attractions throughout the entire gorge area.

However, I think recently there are promotion efforts that have been started, most notably by Mid-Columbia Marketing, and I do also want to point out that in 1982 the State of Washington launched a $4.5 million tourism advertising campaign which highlights our district of the Columbia.

In southwest Washington, for example, the city of Vancouver and the greater Vancouver Chamber of Commerce have participated with representatives from the six-county area of southwest Washington to successfully form and fund a tourism regional information program—or, "T.R.I.P.", as it's more commonly known. We have just completed a brochure entitled "Southwest Washington, Experience Us".

If you look at the brochure, I think you'll find it does a good job of graphically illustrating the ways in which the attractions of our Columbia River can complement Mount St. Helens, ocean fishing, and the other natural wonders of southwest Washington.

The investment potential resulting from tourism is also just beginning to be realized. For example, there are plans for private development of a convention resort center and hotel with up to 250 rooms at North Bonneville. The Columbia Gorge Hotel has reopened, and the Port of Cascade locks is working on its new sternwheeler.

These types of major private and public investments I think reflect welcome optimism about the potential for greatly expanding tourism in the gorge areas. However, they might also inspire a note of caution. As more development begins to occur, careful planning will be required to assure that the quality of the gorge asset is not adversely affected.

This leads me to my third and final conclusion, which is that while gorge tourism will increase as a result of local promotional efforts, there's good reason to believe that a national scenic area designation could yield the greatest possible economic benefit for the area. I think at its very simplest, a national scenic area will give the gorge a nationwide, cohesive identity it has never before had. Putting the gorge on the map as a unique national treasure also gives the credibility that convention planners and travel agents need to have in order to sell our area as a worthwhile place to visit. There can be definite and obvious economic benefits for those gorge communities that develop local lodging and commercial attractions to capture more of the visitors' time and money as well.

The larger cities at the ends of the gorge, Portland and Vancouver, can use a national scenic area to help sell an association on holding its convention in the Portland-Vancouver metropolitan area. In Vancouver, we are especially excited about the prospect of serving as the southwest gateway to both the newly created national volcanic monument at Mount St. Helens, and the Columbia Gorge, as well as some local attractions we have like Fort Vancouver. We are, however, convinced that the ability to draw people to our area depends on packaging and selling a variety of scenic, recreational, and historic attractions.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, a national scenic area designation will give the best possible assurance that future development will not harm the amazing natural resources and beauty that are so essential to continue to attract visitors and dollars to the gorge.

As one last comment, I have transmitted also to you a letter and a position that has been adopted by the Vancouver City Council respecting its position on establishing a scenic area in the gorge.

I thank you again for the chance to offer this testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. I will put that letter in the record right behind your testimony. It's signed by Jim Justin, the mayor of Vancouver, calling on the U.S. Government to create a national scenic area.

The letter does not take a position on any particular bill, but asks the Federal Government to take the lead in creating the area, as I understand it.

Mr. HOVEE. That's right.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you this: Do the decisions that are made upriver from Vancouver have an effect on your tourist and business promotion?

Mr. HOVEE. I think very definitely, yes. One of the conclusions that's being reached as a result of a six-county marketing effort in southwest Washington is that probably no single attraction within the six-county area is significant to bring visitors by itself. What is important is to be able to package them to be able to illustrate the variety of natural and scenic resources and historic attractions that are available in southwest Washington.

So, to the extent, then, that we in Vancouver can combine our attractions—some of the historic things we have in Vancouver as the oldest continuous city in the Northwest—combined with what's happening in the gorge, and to the extent that that resource can be protected, I think it will help everybody.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it difficult if you've got piecemeal legislation upriver—Hood River County doing one thing, Skamania County doing something slightly different, Klickitat something slightly different again—does that make your job more difficult?

Mr. HOVEE. It certainly imposes a lot more risk, I think. Just to use an example, one of the things that has made industrial parks so successful is that they're a planned environment, planned by master development, to make sure that what your industrial neighbor does doesn't hurt your business. There are landscaping standards, and so forth, that are set.

I think you can apply, to some extent, the same analogy to the gorge area to say that there has to be some overall development and management concept that is shared by all the counties and all the communities in the gorge area. Otherwise, the development will be piecemealed, and I think you really run the risk of losing a lot of the attractiveness of the gorge area.

The CHAIRMAN. I realize you're speaking for the city of Vancouver and not Clark County per se, but as I understand what Commissioner Benson said about this tricounty agreement it is not a substantive zoning agreement; it is to review the procedures of each county and make sure each county has observed its procedures; but it does not in any way affect, reverse, or substitute its judgment for the county's. Do I state that right?

Mr. HOVEE. I think that's correct. I should state that the city of Vancouver is really not itself a party to an agreement like that.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, I know. I take it the city of Vancouver doesn't agree with Commissioner Benson that it's really none of your business how the gorge is managed?

Mr. HOVEE. I think the position of the city of Vancouver indicates that Vancouver feels it does have an interest in what happens in the Columbia River Gorge, for its citizens, and for the economic development potential of Vancouver.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you happen to know what the vote was on the resolution?

Mr. HOVEE. I believe it was unanimous.

The CHAIRMAN. Again, as I said to Chairman Buchanan, in my experience local politicians have a reasonable idea of what their citizens think, and you are reasonably convinced that this is a pretty good representation of the voters of Vancouver?

Mr. HOVEE. The city of Vancouver, the city council, before it adopted this position, held a public hearing at which more than 200 people attended. They were not able to take testimony from everyone, but they did ask for written comments and I think received over 100 letters; and, took their position after receiving all of that comment and testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. The city's resolution will go in right behind your testimony.

[The statement follows:]

STATEMENT OF ERIC HOVEE, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT MANAGER, CITY OF VANCOUVER, WASH.

My name is Eric Hovee. I am employed as Economic Development Manager for the city of Vancouver, Washington. I appreciate this opportunity to share my thoughts as a development professional and Vancouver resident to the tourism potential of the Columbia River Gorge.

It is particularly appropriate that any proposed federal legislation that considers a federal management role for the Gorge be first heard by a congressional committee addressing itself to business trade and tourism.

The Columbia River Gorge debate has been difficult precisely because of concerns over the possibility of economic loss for the businesses and residents who reside there. Finally, I think there are some significant economic benefits to be gained by protection of this amazing natural resource. And the benefits may well outweigh any potential losses over the long term.

In any event, Senator Packwood, you are to be complimented for conducting this hearing specifically to obtain testimony on the commerce-related effects from potential creation of a National Scenic Area.

If I may, I would like to begin by formally transmitting a working paper entitled "Enhancement of the Columbia River Gorge" which was completed in August of 1982. This report was prepared for Friends of the Gorge by Elisabeth Lyon, an urban planning consultant. It represents a voluntary work effort to compile information from existing statistical sources, 19 personal interviews and about 8 prior research studies that have all examined the tourist potential of communities located within the Gorge.

In the next couple of minutes, I would like to share with you some of the conclusions that emerged from this work, together with some overall observations I have on the opportunities for tourism development in the Columbia River Gorge.

First, there already a tremendous number of people visiting the Gorge. In 1981, more than 2 million people visited the area's two best known attractions: Bonneville Dam and Multnomah Falls. Even more amazingly, visits to these two attractions are growing rapidly, as indicated by a 70 percent increase in just the past four years.

The United States Travel Data Center has calculated that tourism accounts for over 3,100 jobs in the Columbia Gorge counties, excluding Multnomah and Clark. This means that right now, about 1 person in every 20 who lives in the Gorge is supporting himself or a family from tourism trade.

The importance of keeping and building the visitor trade is particularly evident in counties like Skamania, Klickitat and Hood River where unemployment has been running at rates of 20 percent or more. Even as the national economy improves, it is widely acknowledged that employment in forest products which has been an economic mainstay will probably never again rise to levels of previous years.

A second conclusion is that the tourism potential of the Gorge has only begun to be realized. This is largely because promotion and development efforts right now are very fragmented. While the two public major attractions draw more than 2 million visitors annually, private commercial ventures have fared considerably less well.

A previous study of "Resort Development Potential in the Mid-Columbia Gorge" shows Maryhill Museum had only 78,000 visitors in 1976. During the same year, the Dalles Dam train tour drew about 40,000. The Cascade Locks boat tour had only 10,000 passengers in 1976, but did increase to 30,000 by 1981.

With inadequate local lodging accommodations, short one or two day stays and comparatively low utilization of commercial attractions, it is easy to see that there are some opportunities for local economic development that are now being missed.

There are a number of reasons to help explain why the area's attractions are not being more evenly utilized. There are no staffed visitor information centers at either end of the Gorge. Highway signing even for attractions as significant as the visitor's center and fish ladder at Bonneville Dam are not adequate. While there are a variety of local brochures on specific attractions, there has not been a brochure promoting attractions throughout the entire Gorge area.

There are growing promotional efforts by local organizations such as the Mid-Columbia Economic Development District in its recent formation of Mid-Columbia Marketing. In 1982, the State of Washington launched a $4.5 million tourism advertising campaign, which highlights our "District of the Columbia."

In Southwest Washington, the City of Vancouver and Greater Vancouver Chamber of Commerce are participating with representatives from the 6 counties of Southwest Washington to successfully form and fund a Tourism Regional Information Program (or TRIP). Our brochure entitled "Southwest Washington—Experience Us" was completed just this last month. (A copy is enclosed with the written testimony.) I think the brochure does a good job of graphically illustrating the ways in which the attractions of our Columbia River can complement Mt. St. Helens, ocean fishing and the other natural wonders of Southwest Washington.

The investment potential resulting from tourism is also just beginning to be realized. For example, there are plans for private development of a convention/resort center and hotel with up to 250 rooms. The Columbia Gorge Hotel has reopened and the Port of Cascade Locks will have its new sternwheeler operating this year.

These types of major private and public investments reflect welcome optimism about the potential for greatly expanding the tourism economy of the Columbia River Gorge. However, they might also inspire a note of caution. As more development begins to occur, careful planning will be required to assure that the quality of the Gorge asset is not adversely affected.

This leads to a third and final conclusion: While Gorge tourism will increase as a result of local promotional efforts, there is good reason to believe that a National Scenic Area designation could yield the greatest possible economic benefit for the area. At its simplest, a National Scenic Area will give the Gorge a nationwide, cohesive identity it has never before had.

Putting the Gorge on the map, as a unique national treasure, also gives the credibility that convention planners and travel agents need to have in order to sell our area as a place worthwhile to visit.

There can be definite and obvious economic benefits for those Gorge communities that develop local lodging and commercial attractions to capture more of the visitors time and money. In addition, the larger cities at the ends of the Gorge can use a National Scenic Area to help sell an association on holding its convention in the Portland-Vancouver metropolitan area.

As a representative of one of the two major cities located at the downstream end of the Gorge, this point merits some additional elaborating.

As the largest population center on the Columbia River, the Portland/Vancouver metropolitan area is the major source of visitors to the Gorge.

We contribute to Gorge area tourism in several ways. Perhaps the most obvious contribution is the role we as urban residents step into as "visitors" when we turn our cars eastward along the Columbia River. The Southwest Washington TRIP promotional effort, for example, is finding that our No. 1 tourism market is the Portland metropolitan area. And, getting even the "locals" to visit attractions in their own backyard requires both aggressive promotion and a cohesive, reconizable, quality product to sell.

The convention attendee and out-of-state tourist also represent prime markets for the attractions of the Gorge. Here again, Portland/Vancouver can be expected to make an important contribution.

Because most motorists to Oregon and Washington travel via the I-5 freeway corridor, any effort to point them eastward along the Columbia should occur in the Portland/Vancouver urban area. This requires coordination between various marketing organizations, combined with a quality of attraction that can compete successfully with other well-known destinations such as our coastal and mountain areas.

The convention market is similar in that the vast majority of conventions will actually occur in the larger urban centers. However, Gorge communities and the larger cities can help each other and benefit in this effort.

Having a National Scenic Area in Portland or Vancouver's backyard can be one of those extra "pluses" that sell an association on holding its next meeting here. The convention planner can develop tours for delegates or their spouses. Or, as often happens at the Oregon coast, the conventioneer may stay in our area an extra weekend visiting one of the many unique natural or recreational attractions available only in the Pacific Northwest.

In Vancouver, we are particularly excited about the prospect of serving as the soutwest gateway to both the newly created Mt. St. Helens National Volcanic Monument and the Columbia Gorge, as well as our local attractions such as Fort Vancouver. We are, however, convinced that the ability to draw people to our area depends on packaging and selling a variety of scenic, recreational and historic attractions.

In addition to the nationwide identity created by National Scenic Area designation, there are also two other tourism-generating benefits to consider. The first has been alluded to earlier, and that is coordinated planning.

Right now, what planning that does occur is multi-jurisdictional and fragmented. The federal government with largely autonomous agencies, two states and numerous local jurisdictions all exercise control over some piece of a single Columbia River Gorge.

While the pace of development—residential, commercial and industrial—has so far been slow in the Gorge, that promises to change. For example, east Clark County will witness significant growth in the next ten to twenty years. Hewlett Packard and Tektronix together figure to employ between 16,000 and 20,000 new workers before the year 2000. These industrial plants aand the new I-205 freeway are less than ten miles from the entrance to the Gorge.

The population of Clark County, under recent projections by a Seattle economic consultant, is forecast to more than double—to over 400,000—by the year 2000. Most of this growth is projected to occur in the east Clark County area. There can be little doubt but that even if a limited amount of the growth "spills over" into Skamania County, it will represent a significant change for an area that has witnessed virtually no growth in recent history.

Without coordinated planning involving all pertinent federal, state and local jurisdictions, development will most likely irreparably change the face of the Columbia River Gorge area in the next two decades. One man's vista will become another's development site. As is typically true of suburban development, investment will probably occur in a "leap frog" manner. This spreads the development impact over a wider area and may reduce the ability to retain large areas in more pristine condition.

With planning coordinated, as under a National Scenic Area, development could and should still occur. However, it would be concentrated within existing urban areas. All jurisdictions, including the federal government, would be forced to reach agreement on what to protect and what to develop.

For a Gorge increasingly focused on tourism, the difference between a planned and unplanned future could be startling. Unplanned, uncoordinated development will fragment and perhaps destroy the recreational and natural asset. The tourism potential would be correspondingly reduced. Planned development offers the best chance to preserve the asset, and with it maximize tourism potential.

The other important benefit that a National Scenic Area offers is a banker—in the form of the federal government. Governmental budgets in Oregon and Washington, and at local levels, are under tremendous pressure, and probably will remain so for the next few years. There will therefore be little, if any, opportunity for local funding commitments for protection. Yet, funding will be required for planning, acquisition of critical land areas, and public facility improvements.

The federal government, and U.S. Forest Service, in particular, are in a good position to help without large expenditures of federal funds. As the major land holder in the Gorge, the Forest Service is in good position to effect property trades. Land exchanges may be particularly important as a means to acquire the less than 10 percent of the Gorge area that may be deemed to be critical lands.

As a final comment, let me say that I am hopeful for a "meeting of the minds" between many of the interests represented in the discussion of how best to protect our Gorge. In Clark County, for example, recent public hearings before the Vancouver City Council on this issue were helpful to identify and potentially begin to resolve some of the misperceptions that have been generated in an often emotionally-charged discussion. I am hopeful that this hearing will help in the same way.

A National Scenic Area appears to offer real benefits specifically for tourism. However, hopefully some attention can be focused in the coming months on altering proposed federal legislation to better respond to concerns over the perception of undue federal control at the possible expense of local initiative. A more fully equal partnership between federal, local and state jurisdictions with primary management responsibility may be one possible solution.

A cooperative partnership will yield positive dividends for Gorge area tourism. Minimizing the possiblity of prolonged controversy should improve the prospects for more rapid private investment in tourism destination facilities.

Perhaps more importantly, a National Scenic Area designation will give the best possible assurance that future development will not harm the amazing natural resources and beauty so essential to attract visitors and dollars to the Gorge.

Thank you again for the chance to offer this testimony.

City of Vancouver, Wash.,
Vancouver, Wash., February 9, 1983.

Hon. Robert W. Packwood,
U.S. Senator, Russell Buildings,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Packwood: Enclosed please find a copy of Resolution No. M-2331 relating to the Columbia River Gorge. The Resolution was adopted by the Vancouver City Council on December 20, 1982, after months of discussion and public involvement.

Initially, council received presentations from the Friends of the Gorge Committee and from representatives of Klickitat and Skamania counties. So as to receive a broader sampling of public opinion, council scheduled a public hearing on issues related to the gorge on October 18, 1982.

The hearing was attended by approximately 200 persons and during the time available council received oral testimony from 39 persons. As not all those who wished to speak were able to do so, council extended the hearing for two weeks for the purpose of receiving additional written testimony. Over 100 written statements were received in response to this opportunity.

Resolution No. M-2331 states council's support for designation by the United States Government of a scenic area in the Columbia River Gorge with primary management responsibility being assigned to a newly created body comprised of representatives of local, state and federal jurisdictions or agencies within the gorge area. The resolution does *not* signify council endorsement of any specific piece of legislation now before congress. Nor should it be interpreted as support for "federal control."

As stated in the resolution, the Vancouver City Council views the Columbia River Gorge as a unique national treasure and believes that steps must be taken to ensure that the gorge is preserved as a place for local residents to live and work, as well as a recreation and tourist attraction for all citizens.

Your efforts in helping achieve the necessary and appropriate safeguards for the gorge will be appreciated. If you would like any further explanation of the position taken by the council, I would be pleased to talk with you.

Sincerely,

JIM JUSTIN, *Mayor.*

Enclosure.

RESOLUTION No. M-2331

A resolution relating to the Columbia River Gorge.

Whereas, the Columbia River Gorge is a unique national treasure that offers potential for enjoyment by local residents as well as increasing numbers of visitors, now and for generations to come; and

Whereas, the Columbia River Gorge is a vital part of the regional economy and the livelihood of area residents and businesses; and

Whereas, the City of Vancouver, located in close proximity to the Gorge, has a vital interest in protecting this major scenic attraction that contributes to the well-being of its citizens; and

Whereas, the city council believes that steps must be taken to ensure the Gorge is preserved, both as a place to work and live for local residents, and as a recreation and tourist attraction for all citizens of our country; and

Whereas, the city council believes all interests can best be served by establishing a cooperative relationship among local, state and federal jurisdictions and agencies: Now therefore be it

Resolved, the city council of the City of Vancouver declares its support for designated by the United States Government of a scenic area in the Columbia River Gorge, with primary management responsibility being assigned to a newly created body comprised of representatives of local, state and federal jurisdictions or agencies within the Gorge area; and be it further

Resolved, the city council will support local, state and federal legislation that embodies a concept of full and equal partnership for local, state and federal jurisdictions and agencies directly affected by decisions relating to the Gorge; and be it further

Resolved, the city council urges groups organized to advocate various positions on the Gorge to make sincere and sustained efforts to work together to resolve differences and develop the legislation needed at local, state and federal levels; and be it further

Resolved, the city council urges Governor Spellman, members of Congress and our area state legislators and local elected officials to pursue this matter to a prompt resolution; and be it further

Resolved, the city council pledges its support and best efforts to assist in preservation and protection of the Gorge.

Adopted at regular session of the Council of the City of Vancouver, this 20 day of December, 1982.

JIM JUSTIN, *Mayor.*

Attest:

H. K. SHORTHILL, *City Clerk.*
(By June Rosentreter, *Deputy City Clerk*).

Approved as to form:

JERRY F. KING, *City Attorney.*

The CHAIRMAN. Next, we'll take Mr. James Burke.

Mr. BURKE. Thank you, Senator.

You've asked that I appear today to comment generally on the economic development opportunities in the Columbia River Gorge area and, in particular, the influence of this proposed legislation, S. 2318, on tourism.

So that you may better understand the perspective implicit in my remarks, let me briefly summarize my background as it relates to the area. I am a senior economist on the staff of a Salem-based consulting firm—economic research and consulting firm, Pacific Economica. I also serve as the executive director of the Council for Economic Development in Oregon, which is a statewide association of economic development practitioners.

As a result of my responsibilities in these positions, I've been directly involved in a variety of research projects and citizen conferences focusing on the Columbia River Gorge economy. I believe that my professional colleagues, as well as many of the area's residents and businesses, will confirm my understanding of how the region's economy functions and of its development potential.

After briefly reviewing the proposed legislation, I see nothing inherent to that measure which alone would substantially diminish development options. I recognize that my position differs substantially from many of the gorge residents. As a result, I should add the qualification that the measure's adverse effects should be minimal unless they are caused to be otherwise, and I'd like to elaborate on that.

The designation as a scenic area, as Eric pointed out, would likely enhance the tourism-related commerce opportunities in the area by drawing more attention the the area's and the region's scenic qualities. However, the gorge already has a potential market of 2 million visitors annually. This includes both travelers to or through the area, as well as residents of the Willamette Valley. Thus, if the scenic area designation brought visitors to the area without adequate provision for their accommodation, the likely outcome would be discouragement for both visitor and resident alike. Further, if those circumstances were allowed to persist, it would present a real possibility of tainting the area's tourism market and could, in the long run, end up keeping visitors away.

With regard to the economic development potential in general, we must remember that the area has been and will likely continue to be heavily reliant on natural resources as its primary components for economic activity. Both forestry and agriculture as economic endeavors must be balanced against their aesthetic contribution to the scenic qualities of the area. We must recognize that the distinction between management for conservation and management for preservation will have some effect on how the region's economic health carries on.

Industrial and commercial activity typically associated with more urbanized areas within the region should be allowed to continue within the bounds of the existing government regulation. Also, you must recognize that economic activity also ignores what we call the geopolitical boundaries. Thus, for example, if development is suited for the Dallesport area despite the fact that it may be outside an incorporated community, it should be allowed to occur.

I would add that that does not mean that areas beyond the urban area, or regions outside the urban area, should be, quote, open for development; but, that the urban areas are available and able to provide urban services, and that's where those kinds of activities can and should be allowed to flourish.

Finally, any legislative option that is sought for the area should reflect a partnership between government agencies and the area's residents. It's been my observation, given the level of mistrust and uncertainty that exist within the gorge communities today, that this may be the most difficult objective of all to accomplish.

I realize my remarks have been fairly brief, and I'd like to answer any questions that you may have.

The CHAIRMAN. You make reference in your testimony to conservation versus preservation, and those words are used frequently. You ought to define what you mean before I go on with my questions.

Mr. BURKE. I would suggest that any legislation or Federal program should take advantage of the area's resources and use them, both for the economic health and the tourism promotion, as well as to maintain the scenic quality of the area.

I characterize that—the use of the resources—as conservation, management for conservation.

Management for preservation is simply to set them aside and say as they are they shall remain untouched.

The CHAIRMAN. Wilderness, in essence.

Mr. BURKE. Well, even that is really managed for conservation.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, as a matter of fact, it is.

Mr. BURKE. It really is.

The CHAIRMAN. To the best of my knowledge, there is no genuine Federal wilderness area where we do nothing, just absolutely nothing.

You said there was nothing inherent in the legislation last year, whether it was my bill or Congressman Wyden's, that would impair development. So I take it that you would regard this as a conservation bill, not a preservation bill?

Mr. BURKE. Yes, sir. I read S. 2318 and within the parameters that I could see in that bill, you could write a wide array of management options in there. There was nothing in the bill that said you were going to preclude the opportunity for economic development.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Chairman Buchanan and Mr. Hovee have both indicated, I think rather disparagingly, that they don't think it's likely that the different communities in the gorge are going to get together. Your next-to-last paragraph indicates that, also. You're not very optimistic about all of these counties, and the States of Oregon and Washington, getting together on some kind of united management plan?

Mr. BURKE. My professional opinion, and personal opinion as well, is I really don't think that it's going to happen. We have seen some notable success in the area in the last 6 months, and that was the formation finally of a bistate effort on marketing the area's attributes. I suspect that some of the earlier people testifying commented on that.

But, I think Commissioner Buchanan really got hold of the issue, and that is that the resources required to accomplish this, to do it and do it right, both for the residents and for the entire Pacific Northwest community, and the Nation as a whole, are far beyond the means of the communities that are here right now. I just think that the problem is so out of scale of what their abilities are to really address it in an effective means, to protect their interests as well as address the scenic qualities of the area, that Federal legislation at least should be seriously considered as a vehicle to accomplish that.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill last year, of course, exempted incorporated areas, just said we won't touch them. How do you think we ought to handle industrial development outside the incorporated areas? In many places, it just isn't going to be suitable outside the boundaries of the existing cities.

Mr. BURKE. Well, on the Oregon side of the river we've tried to address that with the urban growth boundaries that have been developed as part of the land conservation and development commission administration. I think that's probably a good approach for the Washington side, too, although I'm sure many of the Washington residents would disagree.

There are some activities, industrial activities, that are, in fact, suited for the more rural areas. But, there is also a way, as we pointed out at a conference that was held here last summer, there are ways to manage and use the resources in the area and to have those industrial activities occur, without creating what one might construe as scenic blight.

By and large, the urban area should be the logical place for those activities to occur, for most industrial or other commercial trade activities to occur. In the cases where there is an exception to that, then you need to recognize that there may be a very legitimate use for that activity out there, and manage it then so that it meets both goals.

The CHAIRMAN. But there was nothing in either bill last year that would have precluded that. Take them on an ad hoc, case-by-case basis.

Mr. BURKE. You can read almost anything that you care to read into that bill, and I think the real test is trying to get the people, the residents of the area, to work with the people who would be charged with the administration and implementation of it to make it work.

The CHAIRMAN. Again, I've made reference several times to Hells Canyon and Cascade Head, and my experience has been that once those areas were created there was no longer an argument about Federal interference, although in both areas the Federal Government has the last voice. It came down to conflicts within the area itself, by the local citizens themselves, as to what was going to be the paramount use. It was not a question of an outsider, on the one hand, against all of the insiders on the other.

Mr. BURKE. I'm unfamiliar with—our area of expertise doesn't, or our exposure doesn't, go over as far as the Hells Canyon area in a professional sense. We have done some work over on the coast. I think that one can point to Cascade Head and say here is the type of Federal intervention that can, by calling attention to the area—Eric said it all the first pass through: There are very distinct benefits from calling attentionto this area, it can enhance that. The trouble with the Columbia River Gorge right now is that if all of the tourist market that we have right now showed up, we'd be in really sad shape to contend with it and provide for their needs.

So, it needs to be something that evolves in a very slow and thoughtful process.

The Chairman. Thank you, gentlemen. I have no more questions. I appreciate it.

We'll conclude with a panel of Nancy Russell, representing Friends of the Columbia Gorge; Charles Williams, Columbia Gorge Coalition; Mary McCurdy of the Sierra Club; Don Hall of the Vancouver Audubon Society; and, John Charles of the Oregon Environmental Council.

Again, we'll take the testimony in the order I called, and if you'll speak right into the microphone because we still have a pretty full crowd: Nancy Russell, Friends of the Gorge.

STATEMENTS OF NANCY RUSSELL, FRIENDS OF THE COLUMBIA GORGE; CHARLES WILLIAMS, COLUMBIA GORGE COALITION; MARY K. McCURDY, OREGON CHAPTER, SIERRA CLUB; DON HALL, VANCOUVER AUDUBON SOCIETY; AND, JOHN A. CHARLES, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, OREGON ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL

Ms. Russell. Thank you, Senator Packwood, and the rest of the panel here.

It's a pleasure to be here to represent the point of view of the Friends of the Columbia Gorge. I am Nancy Russell, Chairman of Friends of the Columbia Gorge.

I have prepared testimony which you have in front of you. I'm going to depart from that just a little bit. Some of it has already been stated, quite often, and some things haven't been said.

I had a request to mention a little historic perspective. I happen to have in my briefcase a letter, so I think I will start out with that, a letter written in 1939 from the Washington State Planning Council. I think this letter establishes that this is not a new idea, this is not the first time that the preservation of the Columbia River Gorge has been discussed; that, indeed, enough time has passed now to really resolve the problem.

This is what the letter says, in part, and I quote from it:

"Towns will spring up around them"—and, this is having to do, incidentally, I should go back and say that this letter results from a study that was done at the time of the construction of Bonneville Dam, in anticipation of the effects that Bonneville construction would have on the area. So, the Washington State Planning Council was concerned with those effects, and wrote this letter.

"But, we are convinced that these industries and the towns that will spring up around them should not in any manner destroy or detract from another great wealth-producing source, namely the scenic attractions of the Columbia River Gorge. Rather, we believe that by proper foresight industry and housing can well be accommodated without detracting from the enjoyment and the grandeur of the gorge by our own people and the people of the Nation."

It also says that Washington's interest in the gorge of the Columbia River and the dam "is too often overlooked by the citizens of the State. Frequently we forget that the State has a full half-interest in the gorge and in the Bonneville development."

The letter then urges "a committee representing Oregon and Washington to study a possible interstate pact for the protection and development of the scenic and recreational resources of the Columbia River Gorge."

It then, in part of the resolution that's on the second page, says that, whereas, there will be increasing industrialization because of the dams, that there is a "need for interstate cooperation between the States of Oregon and Washington in the matter of protecting the scenic and recreational resources of the Columbia River Gorge area."

When we were first involved in Friends of the Gorge, we developed a scrapbook which goes back into the thirties—in fact, even back to 1915—of press clips, and so forth. Cyclically, about every 7 to 10 years, a group would appear that would say, as the Friends of the Gorge has said, let's resolve this problem, let's find a solution that will last for all time. There's always a response: Other people say, "We will do it at the local level, let's have interstate cooperation."

I just want to point out so firmly that in all the years since this letter was written in 1939 we have not moved—we have moved only maybe 2 inches forward, and it's simply time to resolve the problem.

Now, the subject of my testimony that you have was the natural and cultural resources of the gorge. I have hands-on experience in this area, because I have brought hundreds and hundreds of people into the gorge to see it as a tour guide. I've led many hiking groups, I've served many times as guide on the buses which go through the gorge, I've taken caravans of automobiles. Not only have I taken hundreds of people on hikes, but I've literally talked to thousands and thousands of people across the States of Oregon and Washington, even in California, on the gorge.

We have actually carried the message of the gorge with a slide production that the Friends of the Gorge has. Former Gov. Tom McCall took it back to New York, and when he came back from his trip he said it was wonderful, it was the hit of the convention he went to. The gorge is just so incredibly beautiful that people respond to it, and I know that. I know that when groups see the gorge, they are really overwhelmed with its magnificence, and that they would come to see it. But, they don't, as it is. They don't know about it. Friends of the Gorge has brought the Gorge to large numbers of people, but it's a very—as other people have said, it's an untapped market for tourism.

I am submitting here a scrapbook that I've put together of the opportunities in the gorge, the beauty of it, and also some of the conflicts. I have a—particularly, when I came to this hearing today, this photograph was given to me which I think illustrates that you can't have your cake and eat it, too; that you have to have careful planning, that will provide both for carefully planned industrial growth in the right place, and the protection of the scenic resource.

This is a photograph, and I'll submit as testimony for your files, that shows a marker on Highway 14 of the Lewis and Clark Trail. Then there's the Gravel Pit Drive-In, and then there's a gravel operation behind it. The fact is, I think almost anyone in this room would agree, there's a conflict here; that these elements do not enhance one another. That is what Friends of the Gorge is really so concerned about, focusing future development in the right place—not stopping development, not stopping economic growth, but seeing that it's in the correct place.

Of particular concern of our group is the projected urban-suburban development in the gorge on both sides, and other elements, too.

I also will leave it with you, so I will just briefly go over some of the elements and things of interest to travelers that are in the gorge. I'd submit as testimony two articles; one I did recently for Landmarks magazine, which goes out to the historical societies in the State of Washington, and in that I just documented a lot of the wonderful features in the gorge that are particularly interesting to visitors. Also, I'll submit a magazine, Puget Soundings, which circulates in the Puget Sound area, where I did the same thing—talked about the things that people would like to come to the Gorge to see.

Now, I'll just run off, really, a list. I won't talk about them in great detail. The Columbia River Gorge was the pathway of westward migration. The Lewis and Clark Trail goes through the gorge, and there are Lewis and Clark campsites there. One particularly pristine and excellent one is right in the port area of the Dalles, just an example of the kinds of things that groups of historians would be interested in seeing.

Of course, the Hudson Bay Co. used the gorge as a—to come down with their furs from the interior. Botanists came through the gorge early on, and it was a great botanical collecting ground of the 19th century. I have found that groups interested in botany coming from as far away as Scotland have been interested in touring the Columbia River Gorge.

Then the mountain men came down. The Oregon Trail goes through the gorge. There's a very nice segment, within the projected scenic area, of the Oregon Trail on the west side of the Deschutes River that is of special interest to historians. That is in private ownership—not presently threatened, but in private ownership.

There are the portage roads that connected the—where the people had to get off the steamships to go around the fast water. Some of those portage roads date back to 1857 and would provide a wonderful opportunity for people to step back in history and walk over those old portage roadways. There's a particularly excellent one at Tooth Rock.

Then there are the places where the steamboats landed and you can see the pilings there. There are 19th century wagon roads, and travelers—everyone that I have taken up to Shell Rock Mountain, to go up on the 1876 wagon road there, it's really a thrilling opportunity for an historian to see the narrowness of the road and the hand construction. It's just great.

In most areas, those old roads are wiped out. But, in the gorge they exist because they were built high above the water, not to be flooded by the spring freshets. It's just unique in having these wonderful old roads preserved.

So, those are things that are of interest to historians.

The thing that brought me to the gorge so often and with such intensity was the plant life. I started hiking in the gorge and began studying the plants in the gorge, lecturing on the wild flowers in the area. I submit as testimony the testimony of Jean Siddall, who's chairman of the Oregon rare and endangered plant project, that lists the rare and endangered plants. There are 58 of them in the gorge. Nine plants grow in the Columbia River Gorge that grow nowhere else. There's just an incredible interest in the Columbia River Gorge by botanists, because within this short 85-mile range, there is such a difference in habitat, both by way of altitude and also the east-west, rain forest to sagebrush and sand dune habitat, that it's just extraordinarily interesting to groups that are interested in plants. And there are a lot of people around the world that are interested in plants.

Also, there are features in the cities of historic interest: Pulpit Rock in the Dalles; I mentioned the Lewis and Clark campsite; historic buildings; the Fort the Dalles, for instance, and the museum that's there; and, the historic amenities of Cascade Locks, those lock tenders' houses and the Oregon pony, and things that are there are also of intense interest.

Then there are the features relating to Indian culture, centered—many of them all through the gorge—but, centered around the Dalles area; Horsethief Lake State Park, the petroglyphs and petrographs, all of those are simply marvelous.

But, there are—nothing is done with these things. There is no coordinated interpretation, there are no signs, there are no complete guide books. In fact, there are no books that are complete in any sense relevant to the Columbia River Gorge.

There should be information centers at either end of the gorge, and there should be opportunity for the people who come to enjoy the things that I've just been talking about.

The No. 1 attraction, in my experience in taking people in the gorge, is simply its scenic grandeur; that it really sets them back on their heels to see this——

The CHAIRMAN. I'm going to have to ask you to wind down.

Ms. RUSSELL. OK. Well, I'm just saying that it's the scenic grandeur that is most threatened, and I want to point out that the threat of subdivision in the gorge is very real.

The Gorge Commission recently looked at the extent of subdividing in the gorge, and I was disappointed that Mr. Breckel didn't mention that in his testimony, because it isn't a figment of the imagination, it is really there. The most graphic example of the capacity of the local jurisdictions to handle that sort of thing was in the Rizor short plat that was projected across from Multnomah Falls, and it showed that that subdivision, which did not follow State or county law, was encouraged by the local governments—given a green light—and the only reason that it didn't proceed was because of a lawsuit brought by private citizens. That is simply not good enough for Columbia River Gorge. I have other information on that if you would like to have it.

I wanted to comment on something else having to do with that destination resort at North Bonneville. The Friends of the Gorge testified in favor of that resort because we feel that the development of tourism will encourage people to be better stewards of the landscape in general.

The Plainfields, who planned the resort, Mr. Plainfield mentioned that he had financed a private marketing study he was not going to share with us that evening, but I think that you might contact Mr. Plainfield because there is a study—he had it done—that indicated that it was worth his proposing and financing that—I think it's a $6 million resort.

The last item on my agenda is the map which you see on the wall here. There's a key below it. The hot colors indicate protection. I think it's important, when we're asking for Federal help and saying how much we need it and how much we need interstate cooperation and uniform management, I think it's important for us to see the imbalance of protection that there is and how the shore, the south shore, has so much public ownership, so many parks; and, if you look at the map, you'll see that on the north shore there's only a tiny little bit of river access, there at Beacon Rock State Park. The rest of it is really up for grabs.

All the shore land, actually, from Cape Horn to Beacon Rock in the last 10 years has been advertised by the port and P.V.D. (Stevenson Chamber of Commerce) as industrial sites, so I think that there would be some conflict there.

Just to summarize, there is the need for public ownership and protection on the Washington side of the gorge. We very much need to exercise land trading powers which would be possible under the national scenic area, and we need to have the Federal accessibility to the Federal funds, which has been mentioned before.

With that, I will finish. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. Charles Williams of the Columbia Gorge Coalition.

Mr. WILLIAMS. My name is Chuck Williams, and I'm on the board of directors of the Columbia Gorge Coalition, the group that I'm representing today.

The Columbia Gorge Coalition is a nonprofit, Hood River-based organization dedicated to protecting the natural areas and historic sites in the Columbia River Gorge. Approximately 400 households are paying members of our coalition, and our entire funding comes from small, private donations. The entire board of directors of the coalition lives in the gorge and will be affected by any actions taken or not taken.

We're the originators of the national scenic area concept. It's not done by outside agitators, as such. But, the detailed testimony on how we——

The **Chairman**. Do you live in Hood River?

Mr. **Williams**. Across the river.

The **Chairman**. Skamania County?

Mr. **Williams**. Yes, in Skamania County. Since I'm a resident of Skamania County, I'm going to focus on that county.

Tourism's needed in the gorge. I think the present recession, depression, or whatever you want to call it, in Skamania County in particular and in the gorge in general, makes even Skamania County officials realize that we need tourism to help diversify the economy. Tourism is not a cure-all, of course. The jobs are somewhat seasonal and subject to longer-term fluctuations, as is the timber industry. However, tourism's been increasing both in the region and in the gorge greatly, at the same time the other industries, including those courted by the port districts, are declining.

Tourism is especially beneficial because we can have our cake and eat it, too, we can make more money by protecting the gorge, while ill-conceived projects such as the Wah Chang-type zirconium plant almost built at Dallesport and the subdivisions planned across from Multnomah Falls rob the gorge of the very qualities that attract tourists.

I'd like to point out some of the local officials so opposed to using Federal funds for gorge protection have no qualms whatsoever about using 100 percent subsidies from the same horrible Feds to do industrial development in the gorge. Steigerwald Lake, for instance, was 100 percent subsidy between loans and grants.

The **Chairman**. I might add I've been in this business so long I'm not at all surprised. I've never met a local official who would not accept Federal money, even with strings.

Mr. **Williams**. Yes. I heard of a case last year of some town that turned down some Federal funds. But, it made news, it made the nightly news, it was so rare.

As Nancy just said, Skamania County and the gorge has already been chopped into so many small pieces that if all those areas are developed we can kind of, so to speak, kiss off the gorge as we know it. The view from Crown Point will be houses, and such.

My family owns more than 150 acres in one big block, and the people between us and the river own an even larger and more spectacular parcel. This land has been in the family for over a century. All around us, land is being subdivided. Right to our east, Skamania Landing, a large subdivision.

Zoning will not protect the gorge. There is no way. But, even if it could, it would be unfair to those of us—and it would penalize those of us who had taken care of our land. We'd come in, and all of a sudden we can't do anything with our land,and we have no options. We can't sell it, can't subdivide it. Meanwhile, the people who've already chopped up their land into little pieces are being financially rewarded.

So, the only option that is fair to families like mine to protect our land is the option of acquisition, or the acquisition of a scenic easement which has been described earlier. The onlyway this is going to be done is through a Federal park.

The State of Oregon has 63 acres programed to be purchased in the gorge. The State of Washington doesn't have a single acre. I can't remember the last time they bought any land in the gorge for protection purposes. Local governments, obviously, don't have the money.

But, as you know, the Federal land acquisition money comes from land and water conservation funds, which is primarily funded by offshore oil drilling, which thanks to James Watt is increasing incredibly during this administration. So, there's a lot of money in that fund available.

Also, the Federal Government provides things like $15,000 relocation benefits if you do choose to move.

We want to make it clear, though, we don't want any—we're local residents, and we don't want a single person condemned unless they're going to put in a project which violates the comprehensive plan drawn up.

A lot of the talk is about how this bill will shut down the industry in the gorge. I'd like to say it's a good thing that the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area hasn't been enacted already, or it would presently be blamed for all the economic problems in the gorge, just as LCDC is being made the scapegoat across the river in Oregon.

There are some real legitimate economic concerns by the local governments, and when land is bought the Federal Government does pay payments in lieu of taxes, which Mr. Seiberling enacted to go with the Cuyahoga legislation a decade ago. The counties also have less services to provide.

But, that's something Congress is going to have to take into consideration. One way this—you mentioned the Redwoods earlier, and the way that was dealt with there, there was obviously going to be some jobs lost. The timber industry's estimates were more than tenfold exaggerated, but everyone agreed there was going to be some jobs lost. So, Congress authorized EDA funds—Economic Development Administration funds—to provide jobs for displaced loggers replanting clearcuts. There were clearcuts all the way around the area. Over half the commercial timberland in those two counties was out of production because the timber companies had just cut and run, never replanted. So, anyone that could show they'd lost a job was automatically hired at basically the same wage scale to plant trees, replant these areas; which, also, not only protected against erosion, but also provided jobs for, you know, their kids and people coming on up, which you wouldn't have otherwise.

I don't know whether we need an EDA program like that in the gorge, but that's one option. It sure would be better use of EDA money than industrializing Steigerwald Lake, and zirconium plants, and the type of things EDA money has been directed toward by the ports in recent years.

The last economic aspect I'd like to talk about is the fish runs. The primary difference between the Columbia Gorge Coalition and Friends of the Gorge is the protection of the tributaries. We think that the threatened tributaries need to be protected. We have a Skamania County commissioner here who just filed for a permit to dam up Panther Creek, a main tributary of the Wind River, and some people say the best steelhead spawning stream left in Washington State. That's what local control means here.

Those tributaries—salmon was once a renewable resource in the gorge, and we hope it will be again. We want the Columbia Gorge's tributaries protected at the same time in the legislation. If they're not, they're going to be subject to even more development pressure. We're going to have battles indefinitely. We have a 6-year lawsuit running on the White Salmon River. We're going to have the same fights on every tributary. As long as we're going to do this, we ought to do it all at once.

That's the end of my testimony, but I'd like to make a couple of comments about local opposition. A number of the people here have stated that the vast majority of the gorge is against Federal involvement in the protection. That is, without a doubt, true in Skamania County, where I live, and across the river in Cascade Locks. It is not true throughout the gorge, though. I imagine, if you count all the population of the gorge, it's probably fairly evenly split. Hood River County, for instance, did a survey—we can all play number games, but three-fourths of the people in the county were opposed to any residential development outside the urban growth boundaries. The vast majority favored Federal and State acquisition of lands for preservation. Asked to list their priorities, scenic protection was first, industrial development finished last. In Wasco County you won't find much opposition, county commissioners, and other people, are behind us.

You know, it's very split. I have been involved in park fights for a decade, and I have never once ever seen this much local support for a park. Usually it's like the redwoods, where it's urban versus local. Here you have a strong local base, and the fight was, indeed, started by local people.

I don't know whether you've seen this brochure or not. It was put out here a few years ago. When I first saw it, it says "Industrial sights here? In the gorge?" I thought it was a Sierra Club brochure. I opened it up and it said, "Yes, for a few lucky firms." It's put out by the Port of Hood River and Cascade Locks.

What they're saying in this brochure is protecting the natural area in the gorge is going to draw these industries. They're using the scenic beauty of the gorge to bring in industries, and telling them they're going to be protected from competition, and such.

So, that's—well, my last point I'd like to make is there's been a lot of talk about getting the counties to work together. I'd like to point out that the opponents can't even work together. We have new groups, a group a month, fighting us. Mr. Carpenito's group is a month old, that's the fourth new group in the last year fighting us. If the opponents can't even get together, I don't think those of us on the opposite side of the issue are in any way ever going to get together.

So, I'd like to thank you very much for this opportunity to testify. Since we live in the gorge, this issue is very close to us.

I'll be glad to answer any questions you may have.

The CHAIRMAN. The tactic you just mentioned is one I've seen many times in the past. You'll have lots of ad hoc groups spring up on both sides whenever an issue arises, to attempt to give the impression of greater support or greater opposition than may or may not actually exist. But, again, if you're in this business long enough you'll know which groups have been around. Indeed, Hood River

County and the commissioners have been around a long time, and I can deal with them. The Sierra Club's been around a long time, and I can deal with them. I know they'll be here in 5 years.

You mentioned that Wasco County supported this.

Mr. **Williams**. Well, I don't know whether they passed a resolution officially, but they did put in a moratorium on development until this issue is settled.

They've made statements, like Rick Cantrell, one of the county's top elected officials, concerning houses being built on the bluffs here. They said we have zoning, we have LCDC zoning, and everything, and we could not stop these buildings going in. He realizes acquisition is the only alternative that's fair to landowners.

The **Chairman**. I take it you have no objection to economic development in the gorge if properly monitored?

Mr. **Williams**. No. For instance, the Port of Skamania County built a large building recently, which we did not fight. It's a fairly, I would think, ugly building; but, it's within the—right there on the river—but, it's within the Stevenson city limits, and it houses Woodite Columbia Pacific, which I think is an appropriate industry. We have no problems with that. The new brochure put out by Mid-Columbia Marketing, down at the bottom lists how many acres are available within each community for economic development.

We have no problem with clean industries being located within the growth boundaries. It's within the rural areas where we've got problems.

[The statement follows:]

STATEMENT OF CHUCK WILLIAMS, REPRESENTING THE COLUMBIA GORGE COALITION

My name is Chuck Williams, and I am on the board of directors of the Columbia Gorge Coalition, the group that I am representing today. The Coalition is a nonprofit, Hood River-based organization dedicated to protecting the natural areas, wildlife, agricultural lands, rural atmosphere, historic sites and cultural heritage of the Columbia Gorge and nearby areas. Approximately 400 households are paying members of the Coalition, and the group's entire funding comes from small, private donations. The board of directors of the Coalition live in the Gorge and will be directly affected by any actions taken—or not taken.

We are the originators of the national-scenic-area concept for the Columbia Gorge and have prepared detailed testimony on why and how we feel the Gorge should be protected, which will be presented when the Senate parks-subcommittee conducts its hearings. Today, as requested, I am going to concentrate on tourism and other economic issues within the Gorge. And since I am a resident of Skamania County, which is in the center of the Gorge controversy, my testimony will focus on that county.

The Columbia Gorge, especially in Skamania County, has long suffered from a boom-and-bust economy, primarily because of the reliance on the timber industry and large construction-projects, such as the second powerhouse at Bonneville Dam, which spurred prosperity and growth in the area—but is now winding down. Fortunately, the Gorge is such a beautiful and famous place that, if we act fast, we can both protect the Gorge and provide more jobs through increased tourism. Tourism, of course, is not a cure-all for the Gorge. Like logging, it is subject to seasonal and longer-term fluctuations. Jobs in tourism are also often low paying, but if planned properly, an increase in tourism in the Gorge can primarily benefit locally owned, family-run businesses.

A federal designation, such as a national scenic area, would do more than anything else, including the new campaign by Mid-Columbia Marketing, to boost tourism here, as it would indicate to potential visitors that the Gorge is, indeed, one of the nation's "crown jewels." (Fortunately, the Gorge obviously qualifies as a superb federal park.) In addition to the drawing power of a national designation on a map, the unified management of a federal park is necessary to ensure that tourist facilities are coordinated and appropriate. Rather than large, rural resorts owned by absentee conglomerates, we would prefer that most restaurants and overnight accommodations be located in the exempted communities, where the benefits to local residents will be maximized.

We residents of the Gorge have mixed feelings about tourism in the Gorge, of course. Increased tourism means more litter, more traffic on the roads, and more people using the trails and campgrounds we use. Tourism, however, is crucial to the future economy of the Gorge. The current depression in the timber industry should remove any doubts about the need to diversify the Gorge's economic base. Visitation to the Gorge and the region has continued to rise, while the heavy industries courted by many Gorge officials are in trouble. Tourism is also a rare industry in that it allows us to have our cake and eat it too; we can increase local revenues by protecting the natural beauty and historic sites of the Gorge.

Even the most adamant opponents of Gorge protection, including Skamania County officials, now admit that increased tourism is essential to the economic well-being of the area. Many of them, however, refuse to recognize that tourism and protection go hand-in-hand. Tourists are not going to visit a further-degraded Gorge, any more than they would visit a Redwood National Park if there was nothing left but redwood stumps. Ill-conceived projects, such as the Wah Chang-type zirconium plant almost built at Dallesport and the subdivisions planned across from Multnomah Falls, rob the Gorge of the very qualities that attract visitors—in addition to doing at least as much economic harm as good.

Opponents of adequate Gorge protection claim that it would be an economic disaster for the area. In fact, it is probably a good thing that the Columbia Gorge National Scenic Area has not yet been established, as it would no doubt be blamed for the present dismal economic situation in the Gorge, just as many people are trying to make LCDC the scapegoat for Oregon's present fiscal decline. We think that these opponents of sane land-use planning fail to face up to the dire economic consequences of unsound growth. Skamania County, for example, until the recession of the past couple of years received more than $1,000 per county resident from the federal government as its share of national-forest revenues. A huge boom in the number of residents in the western part of the county, which we see as inevitable if federal legislation is not enacted soon, will greatly decrease the county's per capita income. There is no way that increased property taxes could ever compensate for this, especially considering the additional services that would be needed.

Many local officials, here and elsewhere, refuse to admit the hidden costs of providing services to large residential developments in rural areas. At least one Skamania County commissioner has publicly promoted Prindle, across from Multnomah Falls, as a major population center, evidently oblivious to the fact that the rest of the country's residents would have to subsidize the services such developments would require. The effect of a national scenic area, however, would not be to stop any growth in the Gorge, but rather to direct it to the existing communities, where services are already available.

With some reluctance, we support the exemption of the incorporated towns from the scenic area—although we do think that a clause may be needed to prevent polluting industries, such as steel mills and zirconium plants, from being built in the towns. Despite claims to the contrary, however, we are not opposed to clean industries locating in the Gorge to provide jobs. For example, we did not oppose the new industrial building constructed by the Port of Skamania County, even though it is ugly, because it is located within the Stevenson city limits and houses an appropriate industry, Columbia-Pacific (Wood-I). On the other hand, places such as Steigerwald Lake, Wells Island and Home Valley, all of which local officials still want to industrialize, are, in our opinion, totally inappropriate places for industrial development.

We would also like to point out that the very same local officials who are so vocal against using federal funds for Gorge protection have no qualms whatsoever about using huge subsidies from the same "horrible feds" to build heavy industries and even tourist facilities in the Gorge. Nor have we heard any opposition from these park-opponents to a couple of hundred million dollars of federal funds being spent to enlarge the locks at Bonneville Dam, even though this project could be delayed, while Gorge protection can't wait. In our opinion, most of the opposition is to Gorge protection, period, not to the federal role. They know that they can claim that they too want to save the Gorge, but without federal coordination and land acquisition, actual protection of the Gorge will be nothing more than a pipedream.

As the recent study by the Columbia Gorge Commissions so graphically illustrates, the most threatened part of the Gorge, the portion of Skamania County from Cape Horn to North Bonneville, is already subdivided into so many small parcels that if they are all developed, which seems unavoidable without considerable acquisition very soon, the scenic Columbia River Gorge as we know it will no longer exist. While a few protected tributary canyons, such as Eagle Creek, will remain scenic, we can "kiss-off," so to speak, the spectacular vistas from such places as Crown Point and Cape Horn.

While Skamania County officials, such as Prosecuting Attorney Bob Leick, claim that zoning can protect the Gorge, they also, when to their advantage, charge that zoning is unfair to property owners, and that if conservationists want to protect private lands, then they should be willing to buy them. While local and/or state zoning can greatly reduce the cost of Gorge protection, there is absolutely no way that zoning by itself can protect the Gorge; and even if it could, we agree with Mr. Leick and his cohorts that it would be unfair to many landowners. For example, my family owns a large parcel near Skamania, over 150 acres which has been in the family for more than a century; it is where I now live. Our neighbors own a larger and even more spectacular parcel between us and the river. Meanwhile, the land immediately to the east of us has already been chopped onto tiny parcels, the Skamania Landing subdivision, which—among other abuses—has ruined the steelhead runs in the creek I drink from. Other land around us is also being chopped into small pieces and developed. To now use zoning to try to protect this critical area would, in effect, punish those of us who have protected our land and do not want to subdivide and overdevelop it, while at the same reward those, such as the Skamania Landing developers, who have already made a killing by "Greshaminzing" parts of the Gorge. Even if we sell our land or an easement to the government, which may be necessary because of family economic-hardships, we will still be financially penalized for not having subdivided it, but at least we will have the option of receiving some monetary compensation for our decades of good stewardship.

George Rizor, the absentee landowner who—with the blessings of the Skamania County officials—is trying to build a large subdivision across the river from Multnomah Falls, often asks those of us opposed to his schemes what we think he should do with the land in question. Since his land is in a largely undeveloped critical area many miles from the nearest community, we are adamantly opposed to his attempted subdivision (even if he does seem to feel that it has already been approved by God). While we have trouble mustering as much sympathy for Mr. Rizor as we do for resident landowners who are just trying to make ends meet, we do feel that the only way to protect the land in question and still be fair to him is to have the government purchase the land. Similar situations exist throughout the Gorge, including in Multnomah County, where county officials actually do want to protect their portion of the Gorge—but are having difficulty because the option of public acquisition is not now feasible.

To expect the local and county governments to come up with the funds needed for land acquisition is not practical, nor is it fair. The Columbia Gorge is a national resource, and it is unfair to place the burden of protection on local residents. The states are obviously not in a position to come up with acquisition funds, at least not in the foreseeable future. The State of Oregon presently plans to purchase a "whopping" 63 acres in the Gorge, while the State of Washington, to our knowledge, does not plan to buy even a single acre on its side of the Gorge. Meanwhile, federal land-acquisition funds come primarily from offshore oil-drilling revenues, which are greatly increasing with this administration. While land acquisition should be minimized in the Gorge compared to traditional federal-parks, a considerable amount of acquisition, including the purchase of scenic easements, is, in our opinion, absolutely necessary for preservation and recreation, in addition to treating landowners fairly.

While Skamania County officials now give lip service to tourism and are even helping to obtaining federal grants for the construction of large, private resorts, such as at North Bonneville, they appear oblivious to the need for more trails, picnic areas, campgrounds and other low-key recreational facilities to attract visitors to "their" county. Except for Beacon Rock State Park, there are few such recreational facilities on the Washington side. Local residents, such as myself, as well as Vancouver residents usually have to cross the river to hike and backpack in the Gorge, putting even more of a load on Oregon's facilities. In the decades to come, we think that some areas in the Gorge, as determined by the comprehensive plan to be drawn up by the Forest Service and the regional commission, should go into public ownership as land comes on the market, so that eventually river access and a system of trails can be developed, such as exists on the Oregon side. The Table Mountain area, which will soon be made more accessible by the Forest Service's relocation of the Pacific Crest Trail, is an example of an area where more trails and public access are appropriate—and would complement tourist facilities planned for North Bonneville.

The needed acquisition of lands in the Gorge in general and in Skamania County specifically leads to what we feel is one of the few legitimate concerns raised by park opponents: the need to maintain a county tax-base. As I explained earlier, however, the type of uncontrolled growth evidently favored by Skamania County officials will aggravate this problem much more than will protection. Also, the counties need to provide less services and are given "payments-in-lieu-of-taxes" when the federal government purchases lands for parks. Even so, Congress needs to take into account and compensate for any actual economic impacts of acquisition and protection.

Many opponents of Gorge protection like to go around claiming that national-scenic-area legislation will shut down the Gorge's lumber mills. This is just a "red herring," however, as most of the logs for these mills come from outside the Gorge, especially from the Gifford Pinchot National Forest, and this supply will not be affected by Gorge legislation. Many local conservationists, however, do feel that the Gorge's timber economy faces serious problems in the future, due to the overcutting of private lands and the national forest, which needs to be taken into account—and is all the more reason to diversify the Gorge's economy.

When Redwood National Park was expanded in 1978, everyone agreed that some short-term jobs would be lost (although timber industry claims were inflated by more than ten-fold), so Congress authorized federal Economic Development Administration (EDA) funds to hire displaced loggers to replant devastated clear-cuts, which were causing severe erosion and damage to the park. Whether or not a similar project is needed for the Gorge remains to be seen, but such a program here would surely be a better use of EDA funds than is industrializing wetlands and undeveloped areas, which is where the Mid-Columbia Economic Development District and the ports have attempted to direct considerable EDA grants and loans in recent years. No matter how much federal money is spent attracting new industries, there will never be enough jobs if local officials continue to promote extensive residential development, which brings in more new people to need even more jobs.

Restoring fish runs in the Gorge would also, in our opinion, be an appropriate use of EDA funds. The Columbia Gorge was once the best "fishing hole" in the Northwest, if not North America. The economic benefits of the once-great salmon runs have been generally ignored as the fishery has been decimated by dams, poor logging practices and other economically motivated developments. As Congressman Sid Morrison has noted, the Gorge's tributaries are essential for restoring salmon runs, because they are low on the Columbia, and thus the fish spawning here have fewer dams to contend with. Unfortunately, many of the same local officials so opposed to Gorge protection have not learned any lessons from their short-sighted involvement with WPPSS and are now trying to dam these last spawning streams. We feel that Gorge residents have already paid far more than our fair share of energy dues and that restoring fish runs is much more important—ecologically, socially and economically—than is generating more electricity, especially since the power is not needed and energy-conservation efforts have barely begun in the area. Therefore, we strongly urge you to include protection for the Gorge's endangered tributaries in the Gorge legislation, preferably as national wild-and-scenic rivers. If the tributary canyons of the Gorge are not protected at the same time as the main corridor, they will be subject to even more development pressures, and bitter battles, including endless lawsuits, will rage indefinitely, as illustrated by the six-year-long fight over the White Salmon River. Despite strong local opposition to the many proposed dams, the threatened Gorge tributaries need to be saved from "local control." Salmon was once a renewable resource in the Gorge, and we hope it will be again.

The Columbia Gorge Coalition thanks you very much for your efforts to protect our beautiful home, and we appreciate this opportunity to express our views on this issue so close to our hearts. The protection of the Columbia River Gorge is a very complex problem and changes will no doubt have to be made as we go along, but action is desperately needed now, this year, while there is still something to save. I will be glad to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Nancy, let me ask you a question. How many resolutions have been passed? Who supports some kind of Federal scenic bill? We've got Vancouver on record, we've got Multnomah County; do you have others?

Ms. RUSSELL. Well, yes, I can submit as testimony just a long list. I can't remember if there's 80, or—just a long, long list of groups. All the major conservation groups, of course, do, but we have other——

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have other governments?

Ms. RUSSELL. Well, Multnomah County, the city of Portland, the city of Vancouver. They're the only ones I can think of. I'm being handed the endorsements. Gresham City Council is on here. Off the top of my head, I can't come up with anymore municipal governments.

The CHAIRMAN. If that's a list of endorsements, I'll put it in after your testimony. Do you have extra copies of that we can have?

Ms. RUSSELL. Yes, we have many copies of this. Then, also,we have all the editorial endorsements; the major daily newspapers of the Pacific Northwest have endorsed the national scenic area concept, as well as all these organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. Good. We'll put it in the record.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not very many municipalities have fought it, either. Most of them are just sitting it out.

The CHAIRMAN. Most of them are not looking to buy a fight.

[The following information was subsequently received for the record:]

ENDORSEMENTS

Agro Works, Inc.;
Alpine Garden Society (United Kingdom);
Amerian Association of University Women, Business & Professional Study Group;
American Business Women's Association, Mt. Hood Chapter;
American Institute of Architects;
American Rivers Conservation Council;
American Rock Garden Society;
American Society of Landscape Architects;
National Audubon Society;
Business & Professional Women's Club;
California Alpine Club;
The Chemeketans;
Columbia Gorge Coalition;
The Dalles Area Chamber of Commerce;
Eastmoreland Garden Club, Unit II;
Fir Grove Garden Club;
First Unitarian Soc. of Portland;
Friends of the Earth;
Garden Club of America;
Graniteers;
Greenleaf Club;
Gresham Begonia Club;
Gresham City Council;
Gwendale Garden Club;
Hobnailers;
Hood River Pomona Grange;
Inter-Mountain Alpine Club;
Izaak Walton League of America;
Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Society;
King County Democratic Central Community;
King City Camera Club;
League of Women Voters of Oregon;
Washington Wilderness Coalition;
League of Women Voters of Washington;
Mazamas;
Metropolitan Service District;
The Mountaineers;
Mt. St. Helens Hiking Club;
Multnomah County;
National Parks & Conservation Associated;
Native Plant Society of Oregon;
Natural Heritage Advisory Council of Oregon;

The Nature Conservancy;
North Cascades Foundation;
Oregon Cactus Society;
Oregon Environmental Council;
Oregon Park & Recreation Society, Incorporated;
Oregon Roadside Council;
Oregon State Fed'n of Garden Clubs;
Oregon Wilderness Federation;
Portland Beautification Association;
City of Portland;
Portland Garden Club;
Portland Historical Landmarks Community;
Portland NE Republican Women;
The Portland Women's Forum;
Powell Valley Garden Club;
Raleigh Garden Club;
Scottish Rock Garden Club (Scotland);
Shovel & Hoe Garden Club;
The Sierra Club;
Tualatin Valley Gem Club;
Tualatin Valley Republican Women;
Vancouver Audubon Society;
Vancouver, Wa. City Council;
Washington Environmental;
Washington Native Plant Society;
Washington State Central Democratic Community;
The Wilderness Society.

EDITORIAL ENDORSEMENTS

Bellevue Journal American; Seattle, Washington;
The Columbian; Vancouver, Washington;
Daily Astorian; Astoria, Oregon;
Hood River News; Hood River, Oregon;
Eugene Register Guard; Eugene, Oregon;
Longview News; Longview, Washington;
Medford Mail Tribune; Medford, Oregon;
News; Springfield, Oregon;
Oregon Journal; Portland, Oregon;
The Oregonian; Portland, Oregon;
Pacific Northwest Magazine; Seattle, Washington;
Seattle Post Intelligencer; Seattle, Washington;
Seattle Times; Seattle, Washington;
Tribune; Lewiston, Idaho;
Tri-City Herald; Tri-Cities, Washington;
Union Bulletin; Walla Walla, Washington;
Willamette Week; Portland, Oregon;
East Oregonian; Pendleton, Oregon.

The CHAIRMAN. Next, we'll take Mary McCurdy of the Sierra Club.

Ms. MCCURDY. Thank you for providing the opportunity in Oregon for the Sierra Club and others to express their view on the importance of Federal legislation to protect the Columbia River Gorge.

The Sierra Club has over 6,000 members in Oregon and a similar number in Washington. As you know, we've testified and submitted extensive comments on this issue in the past.

The Sierra Club supports Federal legislation designating the Columbia River Gorge as a national scenic area. We believe this is critically important to the long-term protection of the gorge's scenic, historic, and ecological values. We also believe it will provide a solid and consistent economic base for the gorge area founded on tourism and related businesses. Revenues from such an economy will be far more stable and long-term than the fluctuations of speculative developments.

Briefly, we would like to see the following elements included in a bill designating the gorge as a national scenic area. Specific areas should be designated in the bill as interim critical areas. These areas should be protected until a management plan for the entire gorge is developed and approved. The Secretary of the lead agency should be responsible for the formulation of a management plan for the gorge in consultation with a regional commission.

We believe a 14-member Columbia River Gorge regional commission should be appointed, made up of one appointee from each of the six gorge counties, two from each Governor, and three nationally appointed by the Secretary of the lead agency.

The head of the administering agency, or his or her appointee, should serve as a nonvoting member.

Prior to adoption of the management plan, the Secretary should monitor land use activities in the gorge to insure they are consistent with the intent of the act and interim guidelines.

The lead agency should be authorized to acquire lands or easements by donation, purchase, or exchange. The lead agency should have the power to require compliance of local and State land use planning and zoning to be consistent with the management plan.

Within these designated critical areas, the lead agency should not condemn existing residences, farms, or ranches, as long as no significant changes in use occur; and, the Federal agency should have the power to enforce the management plan if the States do not do so in specific instances.

These are our brief comments on a summary of the bill we would like to see introduced, very similar to the bill you've introduced in the past.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any suggestion as to what the interim critical areas should be?

Ms. MCCURDY. We've submitted those areas before. They've been mapped by several members of the Sierra Club. I can submit that to you.

The CHAIRMAN. You would like those incorporated in the initial legislation so that they are at least frozen until the management plan comes out?

Ms. MCCURDY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. Don Hall, Vancouver Audubon Society.

Mr. HALL. I'd like to thank you for giving us this opportunity to address these important issues before us.

The economy of the Columbia River Gorge is hurting, much as the economy of the country as a whole is. Portions of the gorge have been impacted far more than the Nation. We must realize, though, that this is not simply due to the recession alone, but also the long-term trend.

Patterns in industry are constantly changing. The largest industry on the Washington side of the gorge, the timber industry, the traditional base in Skamania and Klickitat Counties, is no longer the strong, vibrant supplier of jobs it once was.

This industry has gone through manifold changes in the last half-century. The greatest of these is the shift from muscle to machine. Humboldt and Del Norte Counties in California, Coos County in Oregon, Clallum and Jefferson Counties in Washington, all have similar stories.

The mismanagement of the timber base 40 to 50 years ago has caught up with us. The use of modern heavy equipment has caught up with us. The number of mills has been greatly reduced, with large, high-speed mills replacing older, slower, and smaller mills. It requires fewer and fewer jobs, fewer man-hours, to mill a 1,000 board feet.

All of these factors have struck Skamania and Klickitat counties. Mill jobs are gone, as are the mills. The timber base is down. The industry has changed. No matter how much we might like it to, the people of these counties will never see the timber industry support their counties as it has in the past. This will be the case whether the gorge is designated a national scenic area or not.

National scenic area designation will take little land out of timber production. As proposed by the Friends of the Columbia Gorge, harvesting would still be allowed in noncritical areas. We at Vancouver Audubon prefer that no clearcutting be allowed within the scenic area at all. Large blocks of land denuded of trees do not in my mind comprise a part of a scenic area.

What it boils down to is a gradual shift away from a timber-based economy. What is required is a willingness to try to control that shift.

Designation of the gorge as a national scenic area would serve as a natural base to work from to increase the tourist industry to a point of preeminence in the industries of the area.

All counties along the gorge would benefit greatly from the national notoriety designation would give the area. A continued reliance on the tourist industry could be developed, but in order to do so the resource must be protected.

Care must be taken to insure the scenic integrity. Parcelization of portions of the gorge critical to this integrity is already well along the way to destroying the beauty of the western end of the gorge in Washington. A look at land ownership maps in western Skamania County, as recently demonstrated at the February 2 meeting of the Oregon and Washington Columbia River Gorge Commissions, discloses large expanses of land subdivided, and only 38 percent of these lots have buildings on them at this time. This means the stage is set for an almost threefold increase in structures in the coming years.

As each of these buildings goes up, a little of the character of the gorge disappears. This won't happen in a year, and maybe not in 5 years. But, if nothing is done soon to stop it, the northern side of the gorge will become a large lotted subdivision, despoiling scenic vistas and lessening the drawing power of the gorge. It really doesn't matter how long it takes; once the scenic resource is gone the tourist resource will suffer.

What must be done to protect this viable resource? Helter-skelter development must be stopped. Development should be limited to towns in their existing urban growth areas. As an economic sidelight to that, with building confined to incorporated towns, costs to governments do go down. Counties no longer have to deal with an ever-expanding road system, which in Skamania and Klickitat, and

I would assume in the Oregon counties, is one of their largest expenses. Services are concentrated. Local P.U.D.'s no longer have to deal with continually stringing and maintaining large amounts of new power lines.

As already mentioned, timber harvesting using clearcutting must be stopped within the view sheds of the gorge, especially in the critical areas. The proposed damming of the scenic tributaries of the Columbia must be stopped. These are valuable portions of the total gorge scenic system and must be protected.They should be an integral part of the gorge management area. For small increases in electricity, we condemn fisheries in essentially wild rivers, fisheries which have already been severely damaged. We would be crossing off one more reason for people to come to the gorge. The beauty of the Wind and White Salmon Rivers, Panther Creek, and others would be far more valuable left as they are.

Aggregate mining must be limited to prevent scarring of natural features. Existing mining must be done in such a way to prevent further defacing of scenic views. New mining must be confined to areas not within view sheds.

To achieve this, a strong management agency is required. With the multitude of jurisdictions now at work in the gorge, the chance of agreement among them is approximately zero. The U.S. Forest Service appears to best fit as the agency to administer the area. It already has a strong presence in the area and an understanding of many of the resources to be managed.

The fact that we are dealing with two States necessitates Federal involvement. This is a landscape of national importance. We have before us a tremendous opportunity to develop a system of parks and scenic areas in the Pacific Northwest which will act as a strong magnet, drawing people from far-off lands—foreigners as well as American citizens.

National scenic area designation for the gorge will tie the two States together, serving as a bridge between the Oregon Cascades and Mount Hood, the newly created Mount St. Helens volcanic area, and Mount Rainier, much as the parks and monuments in southern Utah and northern Arizona feed off of each other.

We in the Northwest are much more aware of the beauty and uniqueness of the gorge than many of our friends and relatives in the Midwest and on the east coast. Designation as a national scenic area will bring this area to the attention of millions of more Americans, and, for that matter, foreign travelers.

Tourism, with its attendant service industries, can give an area that is ailing economically a big boost. But, to do this, we must protect the resource and manage it correctly.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

We'll conclude with Mr. John Charles. It might be easier if you two fellows just switched positions, and he can take that microphone there.

Mr. CHARLES. Thank you, Senator.

My name is John Charles, and I'm executive director of the Oregon Environmental Council.

Since my colleagues have done a rather complete job of addressing the issue, I'll be brief in my own comments.

The Oregon Environmental Council believes that Federal involvement in the management of the Columbia River Gorge is an appropriate way to balance the competing interests within the gorge. The gorge contains unique natural features that must be protected in order for the area to remain as a significant scenic resource.

The simple truth is that people visit the gorge to experience the vast natural splendor, not to watch scattered development take place. Unless the gorge is managed so that various activities occur only in appropriately designated areas, the appeal of the gorge as a tourist attraction will be lost.

There should be no doubt that the natural wonders of this country are appreciated by the American public. The Oregon coast, which is one of the most scenic areas in the United States, has a thriving tourist trade which has benefited from the wise stewardship exercised by the State of Oregon over the years. National parks, protected by the Federal Government, are such marvelous attractions of today we face the ironic problem of overcrowding in some national parks.

Federal protection carries with it the obvious advantage of resource preservation, but there is another more subtle advantage to be gained as well. Much of the tourist trade in the West is comprised, or may be soon comprised even more so, of easterners. For the millions of people who reside in the crowded States of New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and other Eastern States, a trip out West includes stops at famous parks and recreation areas.

Most of these people, unfamiliar as they are with the region, would not even be aware of the scenic attraction of these areas were it not for some kind of Federal designation which clearly marks the area as special.

To test the validity of this assumption, one only needs to spend some time in the various wilderness areas, parks, and national recreation areas which dot the Cascade Range. A significant number of people visiting these areas are from out of State, and many have traveled literally thousands of miles to visit areas which they know only through brochures or maps. Designation of the gorge by the Federal Government as someplace special, by whatever name—national scenic area, national recreation area, or whatever Congress chooses—would stimulate tourism in the region and provide an infusion of dollars to local economies that might not occur otherwise.

There is a growing awareness in Congress that many of the management conflicts with our country's natural resources require regional rather than State response. Interstate air pollution is one such example of an issue that defies simple solution at the State level. Congress is now attempting to grapple with that problem as it reauthorizes the Clean Air Act.

Here in the Pacific Northwest, the Columbia River basin has been explicitly recognized by Congress as a regional resource through passage of the Regional Power Act. The Power Act is a one-of-a-kind statute which attempts for the first time to deal with the problems and opportunities inherent in a multistate resource. The primary motivation for passage of that act was management of the Columbia River energy system. It follows now that the historical and scenic values of the gorge deserve similar Federal protection.

The **Chairman**. Thank you.

Let me say again, before we conclude these hearings, if and when Senator Hatfield and I introduce a bill it will not come to the committee that I chair. It goes to the Energy Committee. It used to be called the Interior Committee. Senator Hatfield is a member of it. Senator McClure of Idaho is the chairman of it.

I can assure you there will be more hearings. This is the first. Most of them will probably not be with my committee. I can't guarantee when or where they will be held, but I know that there will be hearings before any action will be taken on any bill.

That will conclude our hearings for the day.

[Whereupon, at 1:05 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

ADDITIONAL ARTICLES, LETTERS, AND STATEMENTS

STATEMENT OF SUSAN SEYL

My name is Susan Seyl and I am representing the views of some 200 individuals who hold memberships in, respectively, the Northwest Rivers Defense League, of which I am Treasurer, and the Oregon Kayak and Canoe Club, of which I am the Conservation Chairperson. As conservationists and recreationists, these members support a strong Columbia River Gorge Act, to preserve and protect the outstanding qualities that make the Columbia River Gorge a national treasure. We support Senator Packwood's 1982 Senate Bill 2318 to achieve this protection.

In order to reach this goal, we believe it is essential that the identified critical areas receive permanent protection. The critical areas have been defined as those areas of unique significance in the Gorge—visually, geologically, botanically and historically. They represent the essence of the Gorge's spectacular beauty and the role of the Gorge in the development of the Pacific Northwest.

These lands, as with many other portions of the proposed National Scenic Area, are increasingly threatened by development. The level of protection that currently exists is often inadequate or incapable of dealing with new and increased development pressures. Therefore, it is essential that a strong protection mechanism be enacted to preserve the critical areas. By providing public access to these areas in a manner that protects their unique qualities, these lands will be available for all to use and appreciate. To allow incompatible development in these areas for the personal gain of a few would be tragedy.

As currently written, this bill rightly protects existing single-family residences, farms and grazing in the critical areas. A number of favorable options are available to facilitate the acquisition of other critical lands: land exchange, scenic easement, donation, bequest or purchase, with condemnation to be used ony as a last resort. It is important that these guidelines and options are made clear from the beginning to property owners in the critical areas.

In reviewing both pieces of legislation, I feel that the interests of local property owners have been carefully considered with respect to the critical areas. The stated guidelines for those areas, including interim Protection and Management stipulations, must be strongly enforced. To allow exceptions to a moratorium on development would be self-defeating. Strict enforcement of the Management Plan and a responsible acquisition policy and mechanism must be integral to a Columbia River Gorge Bill.

The intent of both bills is clear—to legislate protection of the Columbia River Gorge. How that is accomplished is why we are here, the ultimate success or failure of this legislation depends largely on the permanent protection and preservation of those significant and unique values found in the critical areas of the Gorge.

Because of the particular interests of the organizations that I represent, I would also encourage the expansion of Senate Bill 2318 to include protection of Columbia River tributaries, namely the Klickitat, Wind, White Salmon and Little White Salmon rivers. All located on the Washington side of the of the Gorge, they are an important natural resource that contributes to the economy and recreation of the area. The importance of anadromous fish habitat is becoming increasingly clear with runs diminishing. The recreational value of these streams is also significant. Proposed hydroelectric projects, such as on the White Salmon River, have generated overwhelming opposition from local residents. By including these tributaries in the designated Area, they could receive protection from hydroelectric projects and other inconsistent development. I urge your careful consideration of this proposal.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony.

STATEMENT OF THE OREGON DIVISION IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.

The Izaak Walton League of America is an organization strongly rooted in rural America and has long recognized both the rights and stewardship responsibilities of private landowners. The League also believes that the federal government should recognize the national interest in preserving and protecting selected large and important landscape units that are mostly in private ownership, such as the New Jersey Pine Barrens, Jackson Hole, the Tall Grass Prairie, and the Columbia River Gorge.

The federal government should help to protect such nationally significant landscapes where the task is beyond the capabilities of local and/or state governments acting alone. Protection mechanisms should respect both traditional use patterns of the land and the rights of those who have, to date, been its faithful stewards. Such mechamisms should be flexible, and emphasize public-private cooperation and voluntary action by landowners. The League recognizes that the models for protecting such landscape units have yet to be perfected; it supports testing an array of mechanisms including federal (and other) tax incentives, federal designation of special inter-governmental planning districts, review of proposed federal expenditures and actions for consistency with landscape protection goals, federal cooperation with state-local governments in acquiring easements or development rights, and special loans or grants to assist compatible commercial uses of the land.

A three day national convention is scheduled annually by the Izaak Walton League of America; and it is rotated in various locations throughout the country. The League was founded in 1922 and has a membership of about 50,000. In 1981, at the Izaak Walton League of America National Convention in Syracuse, New York the following resolution urging a National Scenic Area status for the Columbia River Gorge was passed:

RESOLUTION—COLUMBIA RIVER GORGE NATIONAL SCENIC AREA

By any standards the gorge of the Columbia River between the states of Oregon and Washington is an outstanding scenic area of undeniable national significance. It cleaves the 5,000 foot high Cascade Mountains, creating the nation's greatest water gap and wind tunnel.

It encompasses many highly significant geologic features, such as Multnomah and numerous other waterfalls, lava flows, volcanoes and evidence of the Missoula flood, the greatest flood in the known geologic history of the Earth. There are about 800 plant species, including 58 that are rare or endangered and 9 that are found only in the Gorge.

The Gorge has unsurpassed historical significance. It was a travel and trade artery and a major salmon fishing site for native Americans. Sailing expeditions to the Columbia River by Captain George Vancouver (British) and Robert Gray (USA) in 1792, followed by the Lewis and Clark overland expedition through the Gorge in 1803–06, opened the Pacific Northwest to settlement via the Pacific Ocean and Oregon Trail.

Since pioneer times there have been many human developments in the Gorge. Today there are interstate highways, railroads and power transmission lines on both sides. Bonneville Dam and The Dallas Dam are major generators of hydroelectric power and provide locks that convert the Columbia into a commercial waterway. The remnants of once great runs of salmon and steelhead are sufficient to continue to rank the Columbia as No. 1 in the nation (excluding Alaska). The Gorge is important for forest products, manufacturing the transportation and the production of aluminum. It includes significant agriculture, primarily apple and cherry orchards. There are numerous tourist facilities. Also, there are 27 parks and recreation sites on the Oregon side and four in Washington (State, County, City, Forest Service and Corps of Engineers).

In the eastern portion of the Gorge, about 10% of the land is publicly owned. In the western portion, about 44%. The Mt. Hood National Forest (38,700 acres) and Gifford Pinchot National Forest (5,000 acres) constitute the largest public ownership. For the last 66 years the Forest Service has provided consistent high-quality management of scenic, recreation and other multiple uses on these national forest lands.

Within the Gorge, there are over 50 separate local, state and federal agencies attempting to manage separate parcels or functions. Historically, most have had good intentions to protect the scenic grandeur and the natural and historic values. But some agencies have been lax; others have worked at cross purposes. There has been minimal public information and interpretation of the values at stake and how present and proposed development impact these values. Multiple pressures for uncoordinated and irreversible development of the Gorge are accelerating. A reliable mechanism for inspiring that development is in harmony with long-range protection of Gorge scenic, natural and historical values must be established and soon.

In 1979, the National Izaak Walton League of America urged the establishment of a system of National Scenic Areas to provide for private, local, state and federal management of both commodity and noncommodity uses in qualifying areas in a manner that would be compatible with protection of scenic values. The Columbia Gorge was mentioned as one example. In 1980, a National Park Service report recommended a somewhat similar solution. In 1981, the "Friends of the Columbia Gorge" concluded that the National Scenic Area option was the best for the Gorge.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Oregon Division, Izaak Walton League of America in convention assembled at Waldport, Oregon, May 3, 1981, urges the Governors of Oregon and Washington, the entire Congressional Delegation of both states and the county governments affected to unite in a campaign to promptly establish a National Scenic Area in the Gorge that would blend the best features of private and public management and result in coordinated economic development that protects the scenic, natural and historic values, and

Be it further resolved that the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, because of its long history of protection of scenic, historic and natural values in the Gorge and demonstrated expertise in multiple use management, be designated as the lead agency.

PORTLAND CHAPTER 1981

Also enclosed for your convenience and reference is a courtesy copy of the "Conservation Policies of the Izaak Walton League of America" as revised January 1982, in booklet form that summarizes the official positions developed by the League over the past 60 years of continuous work on conservation issues at local, state, and national levels.

STATEMENT OF THE WILLARD WOMEN'S CLUB

The Willard Women's Club of Willard, Washington, has been part of Skamania County for over fifty years. We love the Gorge and want to preserve its beauty and grandeur, and we feel this can best be done on the local level.

We don't want federal control of the Gorge. Many of us have our whole life savings invested in our homes and land, and this is where we want to continue to live. It would create a hardship on us to do otherwise. A federal land takeover would destroy our communities, our homes, our jobs and our rural heritage.

We believe in the right of the individual to own and cherish his own property without any interference whatever. Isn't that what our forefathers wanted when they founded this country?

We can't understand how Congress can think of spending large sums of money at a time when our country is so in debt, and when we have so many out of work. Surely our legislators' time can be better spent thinking of getting the economy back on its feet and people back to work, instead of spending the taxpayers' money to steal our homes and land.

It would seem that we would be protected under the U.S. Constitution from this kind of landgrab, but what else can we expect when we have elected officials that are ready to rewrite or disregard that which they are sworn to uphold?

This old tree-covered lava rock pile the so-called "friends" of the Gorge covet has been here for many years; why didn't they buy it with their own money, piece by piece, so they could create a little Eden of their own? We'll bet then they wouldn't want Big Brother interfering with their homes either.

This same federal government has destroyed the Celilo Falls, The Cascade Locks, North Bonneville twice, and built monstrous power plants up and down the Columbia wherever they pleased. These plants were built by promising us reasonable power rates forever. Can we trust this kind of unanswerable power to keep our best interests at heart?

We consider this proposal, which was conceived by the Portland-based Friends of the Columbia Gorge, and introduced by Oregon Congressmen and Senators, to be an invasion of the state of Washington. One state hasn't invaded another since Civil War days. What's Oregon's excuse?

STATEMENT OF THE GORGE DEFENSE LEAGUE TO THE PEOPLE

The Packwood hearing on the Gorge is a farce and a sham. It is a carefully orchestrated show by the Friends of the Gorge to make it look like there is support for Federal takeover of the Gorge!

Sen. Packwood's office organized and scheduled this hearing on the gorge, purportedly for testimony on tourism and economic development to help the economy of the area. The list of speakers, Sen. Packwood's office reported, will be selected for this purpose. Let's take a closer look at activities up to a day before the hearing.

First, the news that there was to be a hearing was never properly announced to the people. About ten days before the hearing, some people at Columbia Gorge United heard that there were public hearings on the gorge scheduled to be held in Hood River on Feb. 10. They heard it only as a rumor. At that time, a check around the area revealed that no one, not the media, nor county officials, nor organizations concerned about the gorge, had received any announcement by anyone that hearings had been scheduled. Repeated calls to Sen. Packwood's office by the Gorge Defense League, the oldest and largest organization fighting the federal takeover, finally resulted in a definite refusal of our right to be heard. The reason given: the Gorge Defense League has nothing to do with tourism and economic development, and besides, our view would be represented by others. Repeated attempts to find out who would represent our view, and who was scheduled to testify were fruitless. It took many calls to Sen. Packwood's office to even get a responsible person to return our calls. Others in the gorge were having the same problem. As of a day before the hearing, the Skamania County Commissioners had made twelve calls to Packwood's office trying to get on the agenda to speak, still without so much as a return call.

Does anyone think that the Friends of the Gorge and other federal takeover groups were having the same trouble getting information? Not on your life. A list was finally revealed when it appeared in a news article in the Vancouver Columbian on Feb. 8, just two days before the hearing. It contained such well known names as Nancy Russell, Chairman of the FOG; other FOG members such as Dennis Buchanan and Eric Hovee; it has Chuck Williams, from another federal takeover group; it has speakers from the Vancouver Audubon Society and Sierra Club; it has Charles Luce, former Undersecretary of Interior and chief executive of Consolidated Edison of New York, now consultant to WPPSS and FOG board member. How Mr. Luce, who just recently moved here from NY and barely qualifies for residency, gets to speak when long time residents and elected officials of the gorge don't get to speak is no mystery to us. The obvious answer is that he is a FOG member and one of their "big names", and they are helping make up the list.

In all, 9 of the 15 names appearing on the list are known proponents of federal takeover, 2 are known opponents, the rest are unknown to us. Four are members of FOG, one is a member of our group. How the Sierra Club, Audubon Society, Chuck Williams, Charles Luce, and the FOG can speak on tourism and economic development in the gorge, while local County Commissioners, Port Districts, Chambers of Commerce, Business Associations, and gorge residents cannot shows how this hearing is an orchestrated media show by the FOG. A large majority of those on the speakers list don't live in the gorge. Only one, speaking for the Oregon and Washington Gorge Commission, lives in Skamania County.

From this hand picked list, the results are well known in advance. it will show that a large majority of those who testified at a Senate hearing are for federalization of the gorge. No matter that over 90 percent of the people who live in the gorge are against federalization, they weren't allowed to speak. Such blatant bias at a Senate hearing does damage to the credibility of the U.S. Senate. It cannot be allowed to stand. Further hearings on the gorge must be held in the gorge and the people allowed to speak!

STATEMENT OF ROBERT K. LEICK

I want to thank Mr. Imeson and you, Senator Hatfield, for the opportunity to speak today.

I am turning in written testimony which is the same testimony which we gave on behalf fo the Gorge Defense League to the Select Committee established by the Washington State Legislature and appointed by the Governor who, having heard both the testimony of the Friends of the Gorge and the testimony of those opposed to the Federal legislation, concluded that Federal legislation was not necessary and proposed a State and local solution.

The bills introduced on behalf of yourself and Congressman Wyden entitled H.R. 6001 and S.B. something else, and the bill introduced by Mr. Wyden on behalf of the Friends of the Gorge entitled H.R. 6002, are all totally unacceptable to the people whom I represent. 6001 is only slightly less objective to us than 6002. It is impossible to deal with all four bills, two bills, or however many there actually are, so my comments will be limited to Section 8 of H.R. 6001, trusting that others who believe the same way I do will cover other sections of the bill and other matters relating to the Gorge issue.

Section 8(a) provides for the condemnation of private property located within the area arbitrarily defined by the Friends of the Gorge as a critical area, which comprises about ten percent of the total area proposed for a national scenic area. Various figures will be introduced in testimony today concerning the value of the land contained within that area and I believe the Federal Government owes a duty to the people of the United States before they take on this intrusion into the private lives of those people, to thoroughly investigate the potential costs, be it one hundred million dollars or three hundred million dollars of acquisition; and in addition thereto, the continuing costs of managing and policing this eighty mile long stretch.

How often I have heard Mrs. Russell and Mr. Cannard tell people that they do not have to worry about condemnation. Yet, when you read Section 8(a) you will find that the Secretary must find only that either (1) the Commission has been unable to settle differences with the property owner, or (2) in the opinion of the Commission the acquisition of the land is necessary to prevent degradation of the resources. So, either Section 8(a) of the bill does not mean what it says or the people who were told they don't have to worry about condemnation are being misled. Incidentally, I received a phone call Wednesday morning and was advised that a decision has been made by the Forest Service to condemn 140 lots owned by 112 individuals in the Spirit Lake area that has just been made a national monument, and by the time I give this testimony declarations of taking will have been filed on all 140 lots. This I may not be an abuse of the Forest Service's condemnation powers as it may well be necessary to protect lower landowners from dangerous floods but it is an example of what the Forest Service can do if it determines it is necessary and it is criminal for Mrs. Russell and Mr. Cannard to tell the people of the concerned counties that if the subject area is made a national scenic area, that the Federal Government will not or cannot condemn land.

Section 8(a)(2) allows the Secretary to condemn land on his motion by notifying the Commission of his intention to acquire the land without the consent of the owner and ". . . within three months of such notification the regional commission shall vote to approve the action proposed by the Secretary by a vote of seven out of eleven members". Please note that the law purports to tell the Commission when they will vote and how they will vote and doesn't say they will vote either for or against. It says that they will vote to approve it. Maybe this is a typographical error of some sort, or an oversight, but how flippant can one be with our lives.

Section 8(a)(3)(B) is the last, and perhaps the most obnoxious, of all the provisions of the bill because it allows the Secretary to condemn land from a non-cooperative owner and sell it to a more cooperative person. Surely, if the land is so critical to the needs of the people that it had to be condemned from its' owner, it ought not to be reconveyed to another private party! A provision such as this cannot help but shake the confidence of the people in their government when own's own property is taken and sold to his neighbor or, even worse, to a stranger from a metropolitan city.

Section 8(a)(4)(C). Traditionally, when an individual has exhausted his remedies throughout the bureaucratic process he has always been able to have a day in court before an impartial judicial officer. This section manages, for all practical purposes, to eliminate that day in court because it would require an individual to go to San Francisco, California, to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, which could not be accomplished for under fifty thousand dollars nor within a time frame of one to three years. This is neither necessary nor just.

Section 8(a)(4)(D) gives the forest rangers the power to charge individuals who do not fall in line, who paint their house the wrong color, or in some other way violate the terms of the statute, with a felony or with charges which carry penalties of up to one year in jail and a $10,000 fine. This is typical of what could be expected if you put the Forest Service in charge of land use decisions. These are gestapo tactics which would not be accepted by the people of Portland, or the people of Vancouver, and will not be accepted by the people of the Gorge.

Section 8(b) states that the Secretary shall have interim enforcement powers and that these powers purportedly can be found in subsection (a)(4) and section 6. I was unable to find a subsection (a) (4) of section 6.

Section 8 of the proposed bill is replete with offensive provisions designed to frustrate if not eliminate local property owners from the Gorge.

I have talked with many people prior to coming to this hearing in an effort to determine exactly what purpose a federal hearing such as this is intended to serve. I have been told everything from: every word of the written testimony is read and considered, to the more probable statement that the written testimony is weighed.

Whatever is intended to be the purpose of this hearing by you, I would hope that the purpose would be to determine how the people in the area that would be affected by your proposed legislation feel about the legislation. If that is the case, then I urge you to look out amongst the green trees in the audience and, even though, by your rules, you have limited the testimony to twenty-five on each side, you will find that obviously the great majority of the people here are opposed to your bill. If you want more evidence of this the Oregon Journal, the Vancouver Columbian, and State Senator Hal Zimmerman, have run polls, not just in the Gorge, but throughout the metropolitan areas as well and the results of those polls, although little publicized, have been overwhelmingly in favor of local control. I have attached to testimony a copy of a referendum submitted to the people of Skamania County, along with the official results of that election, that when returned showed that over ninety percent of the people are opposed to any federal designation whatsoever. Also, the Washington Legislature created a special committee who heard testimony from both the Friends of the Gorge as well as the Gorge Defense League and others throughout the state and, as a result of that testimony, recommended to the Governor, against federal legislation and for state and local solutions. Others here today will testify that the local government is proceeding with solutions to what others perceive as problems.

Finally, Senator, if in spite of the wishes of the people, you still feel it necessary to force a federal designation of some kind upon us, then I would urge you to deal with the only real threat to the environment in the Gorge in that legislation, and that is the clear and present danger of thousands of gondolas loaded with coal and coal dust steaming through the Gorge on a constant and daily basis to the proposed coal ports in Portland, Vancouver, Kalama, and Astoria. Some have told us that there will be a train every ten minutes. Neither the Friends of the Gorge nor any other so-called environmentalist has done one single thing to slow this down. In fact, if newspaper accounts are correct, you yourself are supporting it.

Are the homes of human beings more offensive than the coal dust from trains?

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF DOUG PROSCH

My name is Doug Prosch. I represent Cascade Pomana Grange #43 of Skamania County, Washington.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I would like to commend you on the spirit of the language found in Senate Bills 2318 and 2319, Sections 13 and 11 respectively, and I quote: "Nothing in this act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, interpret, modify, or conflict with any treaty or other right of an Indian tribe." This is exactly as it should be, however, I could not find any such language concerning a promise of other rights for the rest of the people involved. We the people do have other rights which we believe are inalienable. I would like to call your attention to Senate Bill 2318, Sec. 2, Paragraph 10, lines 9 thru 13, and I quote: "The Federal Government must form a partnership with State and local governments in the Columbia River Gorge, and focus final decisional authority in a single arbiter." Webster defines the word "arbiter" as follows: 1: One chosen or appointed to judge or decide a dispute issue. 2. One who has the power to judge or ordain at WILL. Quite frankly gentlemen, both definitions scare the "Hell" out of us, and brings to mind the classic words: "He has made judges dependent on his will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries. For taking away our charters, abolishing our most valuable laws and altering fundamentally the forms of our government." From this same priceless Declaration of Independence came the answer to correct these wrongs. "That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just power from the consent of the governed." The Washington State Constitution states in Article 1: "All political power is inherent in the people, and governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and are established to protect and maintain individual rights." Article 2, Section 3 of the same document states "There shall be no territory stricken from any county unless a majority of the voters living in such territory shall petition therefor and then only under such other conditions as may be proscribed by a general law applicable to the whole state." We received a 95 percent affirmative vote in favor of local control in Skamania County, and yet, the arbiter can with dictatorial authority over rule the legal actions of our elected officials at WILL. Our vote then becomes null and void and of no effect.

I have seen men die in two wars for freedom and democratic government. We have sacrificed the lives of over 200,000 Americans in the last 40 years because of our dogmatic belief in the cause for freedom. A meaningful vote is surely part and parcel of that cause.

Are non-residents without vested interest of home and farm, and who will never suffer the effects of the proposed legislation, the governed? Of course not! How can those that are not affected by the law be the governed? The governed will be those who will have to live under the quasi dictatorship of an arbiter.

Our freedom was forged by people clothed in home spun cloth, purchased with the lives of hundreds of thousands in uniform, perpetuated by farmers in overalls, along with millions of other working Americans and is being taken away by the tuxs and gown set.

In addition we have Sect. 3 of Senate Bill 2318 entitled "Establishment of Area". With all due respect it might very well have been entitled "A Pig In a Poke". The map referred to does not exist. The map shall become a reality after the fact of enactment, per Sec. 3, paragraph 4 of Senate Bill 2318. We find it incredible that the U.S. Government is going to spend tens of millions of dollars and wrought havoc with the lives and future of thousands of its citizens and not show the specifics in an accurate map.

There are retroactive clauses, all encompassing clauses and even corrective clauses for clerical error—but a map does not exist that shows the absolute boundaries of critical areas or any other area for that matter. We sincerely believe it is not an unreasonable request to see an exact map NOW. After all—it is our homes, our farms, our dreams and heritage through three and four generations that will be adversely affected. On April the 15th of each year the U.S. Government demands an exact accounting from the citizenary. Is the maker of the law not beholden to it?

The subject Senate Bills just may be legal by the letter of the law, but they miss the Spirit of the law by the width and breadth of this great nation.

STATEMENT OF F. STUART CHAPIN, JR.

I am a resident of the Columbia River Gorge and a professional land use planner with some 40 years of experience in dealing with land use matters. My comments are concerned with land use implications of tourism.

In these times of economic recession, tourism as an economic development strategy has great appeal to business interests and port officials in this area. As today's testimony will surely bring out, these interests, local governmental officials and various Gorge organizations support tourism as an economic development strategy.

I wish to support the strategy myself but in a very qualified way. It is axiomatic that tourism must be examined in the context of a broader concern, namely a concern for protecting the very scenic qualities that bring tourists here. As a general principle, therefore, tourism as an economic development strategy must be fitted into a broader strategy for protecting the scenic qualities of the Gorge if there is to be a continuing attraction of tourists to the area.

I strongly urge that the broader strategy take the form of a regional approach to economic development and resource use in which one set of goals, development guidelines and land use standards are established for the entire Gorge. A true regional approach involves a local, state and Federal partnership in the oversight of the Gorge. The Columbia River Gorge after all is one gorge, not just unrelated pieces of real estate in six counties or in two states.

Under a regional approach, local land use decisions for tourism (and other forms of development) would conform to regional guidelines. This would require establishment of a regional oversight agency, for example, a Regional Conservation and Development Commission, under a joint charter from Congress and the two State Legislatures under which all three levels of government would have responsibilities. S. 2318 introduced in the 2nd Session of the 97th Congress and supported by the Friends of the Columbia Gorge reflected this kind of philosophy.

Regional tourism guidelines in this context would seek development of quality tourist accommodations and services in centers such as The Dalles, Hood River, White Salmon—Bingen, Stevenson, Cascade Locks and North Bonneville, where public water and sewage facilities and restaurant, automobile and recreation services would be most efficiently provided. With development of one or two small convention centers in conjunction with tourist accommodations during the summer conceivably whole families could spend a week or ten days in the area enjoying trails in the Gorge and on Mt. Hood and Mt. Adams while conventions are in progress; and during winter period perhaps skiing and other winter sports could become an attraction for conventions. In this connection, with the Portland metropolitan area becoming a center for electronics and high technology, the Gorge makes an enticing place to hold scientific meetings and seminars. It is convenient to the Portland International Airport, it is served by two Amtrak lines, and it has easy access by highway. All of these are viable facets of tourism if dealt with in the framework of one regional program.

In sum, tourism and conservation of Gorge scenic resources must be addressed as interrelated parts of one program. I urge this Committee to support the establishment of a National Scenic Area in the Gorge as an essential adjunct to development of tourism here.

STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE TO PRESERVE PROPERTY RIGHTS IN THE COLUMBIA RIVER GORGE

Members of the Committee: We are gratified to see the Senate Commerce Committee taking an interest in the future of the Columbia River Gorge in light of legislation submitted to Congress last year to create a 'National Scenic Area' here. As Mr. Raymond Dassman of the Conservation Foundation has pointed out in The Destruction of California, the creation of Federal parks and wilderness areas often overlooks the effect of those set-asides on a area's economic viability, its communities' survival, and residents' individual lives. We are glad to see Congressional recognition in the Commerce Committee's presence here that there is more than scenery at stake in the Columbia River Gorge.

The Columbia Gorge has been a vital link in the nation's economy since the earliest days of Western settlement. Its highways, rail lines and waterway are the main transportation corridor tying West Coast ports to the products and markets of the nation and the world. Its dams provide electric power to an entire region. Its wheat, fruit and timber are shipped worldwide. Its scenery is driven past—one can hardly call it "viewed"— by over 2,000,000 travelers annually, 90 percent of whom do not contribute one thin dime to the local economy in their passing. And it is the home of 41,000 Americans who live in this location by choice and as free citizens, and whose presence here for more than 3 generations has made so little impact on the landscape and environment that their existence has been, and continues to be, roundly ignored.

The proposal to place the Columbia River Gorge under centralized Federal management in the name of "scenic preservation" has raised serious questions about the continued viability of the area's trade and tourism, and the ability of the local economy to survive, under the burden of such imposed 'preservation'. It has raised grave doubts whether the people who live here are going to be allowed to continue to do so, or whether they are to be squeezed out between the twin pressures of the permanent elimination of jobs and the wholesale confiscation of private property which is authorized in order to carry out this 'preservation'. And it has raised public concern bordering on outrage, inside and outside the Gorge, that the United States Government would or could be seriously considering the deliberate imposition of such drastic measures against its own citizens, and be considering, moreover, the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to finance this dragonnade in the midst of the worst economic depression in 50 years.

We must point out that this hearing is being conducted without the public participation of any local residents, local governments, port districts, or chambers of commerce within the area which this legislation proposes to impact. These are the people who are in closest touch with the area, its economy, and its needs. These are the people who are directly responsible for managing and promoting the area's trade, tourism, and economic development which are the subject matter of this hearing by the Commerce Committee. These are, furthermore, the people most aware of and best able to provide testimony on the economic effects attendant upon the proposed transformation of the Columbia River Gorge into a Federally-operated scenic preserve. We regret the Committee did not see fit to invite the public participation of these important parties in discussion of a matter affecting their communities' future economic health and survival. We regret the Committee did not inform them in advance that hearings were to take place. We regret the Committee has rebuffed their belated appeals to allow their concerns to be aired in public hearing, and has neglected to make public in timely fashion the Committee's deadline for submission of written testimony for the hearing record. The Committee to Preserve Property Rights in the Columbia River Gorge shares these parties' concern that a hearing dominated by non-local interests, who lack familiarity with the area, its economy and needs, who will not have to live with the effects of Congressional action impacting this area, and who have, in the main, been proponents or supporters of Federal confiscation or control of privately owned land in the Columbia River Gorge, is incomplete and prejudicial. We urge the rectification of this situation by scheduling another hearing under the Commerce Committee's aegis, at which the concerns of local residents, governments, port districts, and chambers of commerce about the effect of 'scenic area' legislation on their trade, tourism, and economic development, may be thoroughly and publicly aired. We respectfully request these parties be given sufficient notice to enable them to prepare meaningful testimony within the scope of the Committee's concern.

Independent evidence of any economic benefits arising from a Federal scenic preserve designation for the Columbia River Gorge is conspicuously absent. While the proponents of Federal-control legislation, the tiny but well-financed 'Friends of the Gorge', have produced their own study (the release of which was timed to coincide with the Committee's hearings) to back up their own claims of economic benefits, even their own sources provide no substantiation for their self-serving conclusion. The claim that an economic boom will occur following the imposition of centralized Federal management of the Gorge is no more than an opinion of the 'Friends of the Gorge, which remains devoid of any substantiating evidence.

The 'Scenic Area' legislation itself speaks only of 'perpetuating' the existing economy of the area, but even that is unsubstantiated. In fact, economic devastation is more likely to be the result from the condemnation of up to 20 percent of the area's privately-owned land (half of the Columbia Gorge is already Federally owned), the restriction of timberland to 'scenic' uses, the elimination of customers on which area businesses are dependent for survival, the acquisition of commercial and industrial property outside incorporated towns which the Gorge's new managers determine is 'incompatible' with 'scenic' purposes, and the destruction of every local jurisdiction's tax base through the Federal acquisition or restriction of use (and value) of private property. These actions, all authorized by the proposed 'scenic' legislation, are incompatible with the perpetuation of the economic life of the area even at today's low ebb, which has left 20 to 40 percent of the population of the Columbia Gorge unemployed. Indeed, the legislation causes more problems than it solves.

It also 'solves' some 'problems' which do not in fact exist. The Columbia Gorge, according to the proposed legislation, is 'threatened' by 'rapid population growth', 'uncontrolled development', and the existence of 'more than 50 jurisdictions', all cited as reasons for the necessity of centralized Federal management. Where are these 'threats'? The population of the Gorge has been decreasing for years; it is lower than it was 3 years ago, and lower by far than 50 years ago. 'Uncontrolled development' cannot legally happen, thanks to the implementation in both Oregon and Washington of some of the tightest land-use restrictions in effect anywhere in the United States. And nowhere in the legislation is it mentioned that over half of those 'more than 50 jurisdictions' are agencies of the Federal Government.

It is quite true that the numerous Federal agencies operating in the Columbia Gorge have a deplorable tendency to act autonomously, in uncoordinated fashion, and often in direct opposition to one another. To suggest that the proposed 'Scenic Area' legislation will do anything about this program however, is false. Section 7(a) of that legislation (S. 2318) provides that:

> 'Lands and waters under the jurisdiction of any department or agency of the United States shall remain under such jurisdiction';

and Section 8(c)—entitled 'Intergovernmental Cooperation'—provides that:

> 'Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit or prohibit any Federal action ordered by a court of competent jurisdiction or directed by a Federal agency for the protection of public health or safety, or for national defense.'

If this legislation had been in effect 50 years ago, with all its pretensions about 'preserving the existing character of the landscape' and all its decrying of the 'intense human impact' of dams, highways, and the like, it would not have been able to prevent a single one of those massive dams or navigation locks from being built by the Army Corps of Engineers, nor the construction of I-84, that 'important link' in the national system of 'Interstate and Defense Highway'. (It will, however, prohibit any local utility or government from building any hydropower facilities of its own, or from extending or upgrading its water and sewer lines or roads.) If the Department of Defense wanted to site the MX missile in the Columbia Gorge, this 'National Scenic Area' Act would not and could not stop them from doing so.

The legislation permits agencies of the Federal government—which constitute a majority of those 'more than 50 jurisdicions' which are complained about—to continue to act independently and at cross-purposes. All this legislation does is make local and state government in the Gorge subject to whatever regulations *one* of those Federal agencies—the U.S. Forest Service—decides to impose. Section 8(b) of the proposed legislation specifically provides that state and local governments are to be limited to enforcement of the Forest Service's regulations (plus whatever laws those regulations don't supercede), and to the collection of taxes on whatever privately-owned land remains.

The legislation delegates to the Federal managers of the proposed new park—all appointees of the Secretary of Agriculture—not only most of the authority and functions of elected local government, but also a broad and comprehensive authority over the personal liberties and property of an unspecified number of people in an area of unspecified size. The Forest Service is given the authority to determine on its own how big this new park is going to be, the details of its management and operation, how much it is going to cost the nation's taxpayers, and how much land is going to be allowed to remain in private ownership.

The concentration of such authority in the hands of persons who are neither elected by nor accountable to the voters in any way, and whose actions are subject to review only by their own appointed superiors in Washington, D.C., is a matter of grave concern. It has been described as very little different from the colonial system which the American people rejected over 200 years ago. It treats privately-owned property as a 'resource' which is to be exploited for the benefit of a national government 3,000 miles away, and residents as 'indigenous natives' who have no right to be here, whose presence is to be tolerated as long as they 'behave', and who are to be eliminated if, or when, they get in the way. The serious consideration and active support of this legislation by some elected officials—including members of Congress—evidences a bias against elected government which is inappropriate and unhealthy on the part of elected representatives of the people.

The legislation has been promoted as protecting the environment of the Gorge. In fact, it does no such thing. All it does is transfer the ability to protect the Gorge—or to 'develop' it—out of the hands of elected local and state government and into the hands of appointed Federal 'experts' whose qualifications for the job include neither residency in nor familiarity with the area.

The Gorge's well-preserved state to date, despite its proximity to a major metropolitan area, and without—it fact, often in spite of—Federal actions, seems to be attributable primarily to the concerted efforts of an environmentally aware and conservation-minded local citizenry and local government. These efforts should be being recognized and encouraged, not cast aside in favor of something nebulous and untried. One must question whether transferring the authority and responsibility for the future of the Columbia River Gorge to the Federal government—whose primary contribution to preservation of this 'scenic treasure' has been 3 hydroelectric dams, a 4-lane freeway, and miles of transmission lines strung across the face of our cliffs—is at all a good idea.

This legislation is unnecessary, counter-productive, and destructive to the region's economy and tax base, to the authority of elected government and to individuals' civil rights. It additionally represents a cost to the American taxpayers of hundreds of millions of dollars, at a time of skyrocketing budget deficits and unemployment, of cutbacks in every sort of social program, and of public clamor for a reduction, not increase, in the size, scope, and meddlesomeness of the Federal bureaucracy.

This 'Scenic Area' legislation is not in the public interest. In fact, it does not appear to be in the interest of anyone except the few small and well-financed groups of professional wilderness advocates here and in Washington, D.C., who have been lobbying for the creation, at public expense, of 'their' new park. The voters of Skamania County, Washington, at the general election in November, 1981, voted 94% against Federal control of the Gorge. A survey taken of every household in a 22-mile stretch of river between Bridal Veil and Wyeth, Oregon, in October, 1982, found 96.8% against Federal control of the Gorge. And even in the Portland metropolitan area, an October 1982 poll could find only 14% of its scientifically-selected sampling favored Federal control of the Gorge; 65% opposed it. While it is obvious that sombody wants the Columbia River Gorge transformed into a Federal 'scenic preserve', it does not appear to be the voters.

We submit that the 'preservation of scenery' is not and should not be a national priority justifying the condemnation of private property, the restriction of civil liberties, and the destruction of local government. We submit further that the people who live in the Columbia River Gorge have and should have the same rights as any other American citizens, including the right to control their own local affairs through their own freely elected governments, and that no government has any business trying to take those rights away.

The people neither need nor want this sort of legislation. We suggest that Congress' time, the taxpayers' money, and the public trust could be better devoted to finding solutions to some of the nation's real problems, and we urge the Committee to consign these Federal 'scenic area' proposals to the abyss whence they came. We note that President Reagan, in his inaugural address, promised to 'return government to the American people.' The Committee—and Congress—could help by refusing to take any more of it away.

STATEMENT OF CHLOVENA B. METZGER

Our family moved to Vancouver from Michigan in 1965. As we drove throught the Columbia River Gorge feeling like latter-day Oregon Trail pioneers, we were moved to awe and wonder, so struck by the natural beauty of the Gorge that the many weary miles behind us were forgotten in an enthusiastic embrace of our new home.

That initial reponse to the beauty of the Gorge has been augmented through the years by countless family hikes, picnics, cross-country ski trips, drives and campouts in the Gorge. The Gorge has become a near and dear part of all of us.

By extension, then, the Gorge is just as important to every single soul who is touched by it, either through everyday proximity or as a tourist drinking deeply of its beauty for abiding inspiration and wholeness. Such a treasure demands the highest standards of stewardship so that its scenic and historic values are never destroyed.

How I wish the Gorge could safely be entrusted to preservation through local control! Unfortunately, history teaches us that rare is the private citizen-landholder who places the good of the commonwealth above his own individual property rights to do as he wishes with his own land. So close is the Gorge to the Portland-Vancouver area that as population increases, the threat of destruction of the Gorge's unique value becomes ever more imminent.

My plea is: Intervene before it is too late! Create a national scenic area to save the Gorge for all of us and for posterity.

The Gorge gives us an irreplaceable panoply of natural riches. Can we give back less than a national pledge of preservation in perpetuity?

Thank you for your attention and consideration.

STATEMENT OF KENNETH D. HOBSON, CITY ADMINISTRATOR, IN BEHALF OF THE CITY OF CASCADE LOCKS

We welcome the Senate Commerce Committee's considering the economic impacts of federal designation of a "National Scenic Area" here in the Columbia River Gorge. This, to many persons, however, is an aside to the real question of who governs, who controls, who makes the decisions of to what best use our lands shall be put? In order that we can speak to your agenda, we must first go on record again as strongly opposing federal management or control of the Gorge. Attached is Resolution 414 which the council adopted unanimously stating some of our reasons for limiting a federal role.

The basic economic argument in favor of some federal legislation says a federally designated "Scenic Area" is good for tourism and the corollaries to that proposition are that there exists a need for greater coordination of planning efforts, both land use and otherwise; that we need to be more aware and concerned for the preservation of valuable historical land cultural sites and that we should generally protect our scenic vistas and in other ways make or keep the Gorge in it's natural environment an aesthetically beautiful place to visit.

Those objectives, on there face, are laudable and nearly everyone can embrace them with enthusiasm. The city has been and is now actively supportive of land use planning efforts, the promotion of tourism and the protection of scenery and historical and cultural sites and artifacts. However, as you are all well aware, as like so many other things, there exists competing, equally laudable, objectives, which must be addressed, hopefully, before any law is passed, plan is made or property condemned. What we, and other residents of the Gorge, are trying very hard to do, is have you understand that there exists an economy in the Gorge now, that we are the major part of the economy and that if you propose to alter forever the Gorge economy—and our lives—then it should be very thoroughly studied and fairly evaluated before any irreversible actions are taken and that we, as residents, of the Gorge, should have the primary role in that determination. Frankly, many persons in the Gorge are mad, and perhaps a little frightened that the vise of losing traditional jobs and confiscation of private property may squeeze the life, as we know it, out of the Columbia River Gorge. Then proponents would offer us some park space that we might come and visit, and say, this used to be home.

Our concern should be your concern. We need an EEIS (Economic Environmental Impact Statement) before any legislation is finally adopted. We have to have better information as to how our existing economy is functioning today and how it would be transformed by such far-reaching bills as were proposed last year. We need a complete inventory of property that would be considered for outright purchase or building rights, the effects of such acquisitions on individuals, communities, utilities and government entities, both the human and financial costs of such a chnage, facts about the make-up of the existing economic structure and the likely affects of such a dramatic change. If all timberland is reserved for scenic uses, what of our mill workers? If less land is taxable, who will pay more? If more tourists drive our streets, use our parks and need police services, who will pay more?

The original "three threats" used as justification for a federal role were "rapid population growth, uncontrolled development and more than 50 jurisdictions." Our responses are simple and straightforward, "actual population decrease, the most far-reaching and progressive system of land use controls in the country and add 1 more jurisdiction."

Beyond that original list, the litany has not been expanded. We hear that the locals will sell out to monied entrepeneurs; only the federal government can save us. Remember, we are the ones who have preserved and protected the diverse scenic quality we know so well; the federal government has made what changes it felt best. We hear that local governments, even state governments can't afford to do anything; only the federal government has the resources. We also hear the federal government doesn't have enough money to maintain and manage properly the holdings it's now responsible for. We hear that the federal government owns 90% of the Oregon land proposed for this area already. If the federal government hasn't substantially achieved the goal with 90% control already, that should tell us something. We hear that only the federal government has the expertise. Does anyone really believe that? We hear it compared to the redwoods and arguments put forth that it is of national interest and concern and those national interests will not be protected by residents of Washington and Oregon. Well, we just don't know; but we believe we have a good track record. Some of the federal tracks that we're aware of; we don't think we want to run on.

Federal legislation and management is basically a transfer of responsibilities from elected local and state officials to federally appointed "experts" whose qualifications for the job include neither residency and direct familiarity and contact with the land and the people who live on it, nor a real life stake in what happens to us.

We look forward to additional hearings where we will have an opportunity to present our views. We look forward to an honest evaluation of the probable affects that this type of legislation would likely have on the Gorge economy and habitability for its residents. And we look forward to our role in managing the Columbia River Gorge for future generations.

VANCOUVER ORTHOPEDIC GROUP, P.S.,
Vancouver, Wash., September 8, 1982.

Hon. MARK HATFIELD,
U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HATFIELD: When my family and I moved to the Northwest, the Columbia Gorge presented itself as one of the most beautiful scenic areas in the United States. Such a wonder of nature needs to be preserved for an entire nation and for more than the present generation of Americans.

To prevent the Gorge's exploitation by individual private interests, I encourage you to foster its protection by the federal government. Who would leave the fate of Yellowstone to be determined by local and state governments in which the National Park is located?

Please represent the needs of all Americans rather than the vested property interests of present residents who can threaten the Columbia Gorge's landscape with uncontrolled suburban sprawl and industrialization.

Yours truly,

BEN H. MCGOUGH, JR., M.D.

COLUMBIA RIVER GORGE SCENIC AREA,
Vancouver, Wash., September 10, 1982.

Senator MARK HATFIELD,
Washington, D.C.

TO WHOM IT CONCERNS: Preservation of the Columbia River Gorge as it is now should become a priority with all who value its recreational resource, its fantastic and ever-changing beauty, its unsurpassed value as on educational facility to better understanding of the history and development of the Pacific Northwest.

I urge you to exert your influence and energy in gaining federal protection for the Columbia River Gorge. Please include this statement as part of the record of this hearing.

BARBARA L. BRAY.

VANCOUVER, WASH., *September 10, 1982.*

DEAR SENATOR HATFIELD: Please include my personal statement, which follows, in the official record of the September 10th hearing on the Columbia River Gorge Act of 1982.

I am the secretary of Friends of the Columbia Gorge. The most compelling reason for my wholehearted involvement in the effort to effect a National Scenic Area for preservation of the Gorge is that I travel the Washington side of the Gorge at least once a week and am therefore conscious of the pace and type of changes occurring because no plan now exists for orderly development. My husband and I own a farm in Klickitat County to which we routinely travel to work, and the regularity of our trips permits us to observe a number of changes in the landscape that might not be so noticeable to either the occasional visitor or the residents who are most aware of their own neighborhoods.

One of the most disturbing land change uses, in my view, is the usurpation of farm/grazing land for a large mobile home park just west of Gibbons Creek, the proposed western boundary for the Columbia River Gorge Scenic Area. Less than five year ago one could see hay being cut and baled on that land. Now endless rows of box-like structures, ungraced by mitigating landscaping, are a jarring note at the edge of a rural setting. At present, apartments are being constructed just west of the mobile home park. Across Highway 14 to the south, the western end of Steigerwald Lake has lost its former thrust as prime bird habitat and is now an industrial park. One wonders if that is to be the fate of the eastern portion of that lake/marshland, which is feeding ground for blue heron and nesting area for the marsh hawks and Canadian geese. The push for development is ever eastward and time is of the essence.

In Skamania County no zoning provides protection for the land. Large handmade signs edge the highway announcing land for sale in 3-5 acre parcels.

In Klickitat County, Burdoin Mountain has fallen to a developer's plan to divide it into view lots so that purchasers may see the magnificent Columbia River while Oregon travelers will see endless homes along the Washington bluffs.

The point I wish to make clear is that, in asking for a National Scenic Area, my concern has arisen from what has been happening and continues to happen right along in terms of disappearing farmlands and haphazard development that often shows little or no regard for the aesthetics or the effect on an otherwise spectacularly beautiful area.

While I do have concern about the increased pace of unplanned development on the Washington side of the Gorge once the I205 bridge is completed, it is not necessary to imagine future damage in order to realize the need for a comprehensive plan. The problem is here and now. The degradation is taking place in increments that may escape the attention of a Gorge resident if he stays close to home and doesn't travel along that corridor frequently.

Because I am for a solution that will preserve the scenic, economic, cultural and historic value of the Gorge and the rights of its residents, I strongly favor the Columbia River Gorge Act of 1982, S 2318, a partnership of federal, state and local governments.

Sincerely,

PHYLLIS CLAUSEN.

February 10, 1983.

DEAR SENATOR PACKWOOD: We accidently heard by the grapevine that a hearing is being held on the Columbia River Gorge at Hood River Feb. 10, 1983. This meeting, we understand is concerning Commerce and Tourism in the Gorge and doesn't ask for any data from us living in the Gorge. We would certainly appreciate the courtesy of being notified of any future hearings or meetings concerning the Columbia River Gorge since it affects all aspects of our lives, our childrens lives, our grandchildren and on down the line.

Since the History and Heritage of the Columbia River Gorge is of interest to Tourism, we feel we should be represented by the people living in the Gorge.

We and our ancestors felled snags and cleared land to make it the beautiful country it is. This is after Fire damage. While we cleared our own land of brush and stumps, we also planted thousands of trees and eliminated many thousands of Blackberry vines, Canadian Thistles, Tansy, etc. We grow some of the largest filberts in the world and were some of the first orchards to be planted and grafted in the Columbia River Gorge.

When we look at our places we see the History of our ancestors, us and our children, etc. The trees we planted . . . A Redwood Tree was planted when one of our daughters was born. It is now 100 ft. tall.

One of us was born and raised on the Homestead joining our place, which is still in the family, planted Cedar trees for wind breaks. His Dad sent him by horseback, which was the only transportation they had, to the Gravel Pit on the Old Military Road at Belle Center for these Cedar Trees. These trees are now over 5 ft. through and 100 ft. tall.

The people that live in the Columbia River Gorge 365 days of the year are far better qualified to know the ins and outs of the Columbia River Gorge, whether it be Tourism or Commerce.

We enjoy Tourists and they can look all they wish, but don't let this legislation destroy our way of life, our homes, our livelihood, our American Dream, our History and our Heritage.

There is room for Tourism, Commerce and the Residents of the Columbia River Gorge.

Very Sincerely,

MARVIN A. JEMTEGAARD.
LOIS C. JEMTEGAARD.

Carson, Wash.

DEAR SENATOR PACKWOOD: The Columbia River Gorge Act of 1982, if passed will be in direct conflict with an Act of Congress dated 120 years ago on May 20, 1862 entitled to "Secure Homesteads to Actual Settlers on Public Domain." Passage of this act opened up the rocky inacessible wilderness areas of the Gorge land. Ancient storms had left jungles of twisted masses of fallen timber and snags from lightning fires. There were no roads, only the river.

Many of our homesteaders who came to clear this land were from the small Scandinavian countries where land and timber is very precious. They came with their skills, hand axes and saws; rowed across the Columbia river and carried food packs on their backs for many steep-rugged miles to reach their land. As the years passed they built their own roads with pick and shovel. They put out lightning fires to protect what was then the Columbia National Forest. There were no unemployment checks, no pension plans, no social security, no gold watches to compensate for their lifetime of hard labor.

As we carried their worn and spent bodies to the lonely cemetary high on the hill overlooking the gorge we can ask "Why did they have to live a lifetime of hardships?" This new bill will cancel forever the dreams and hopes these dedicated people had for our future generations to continue caring for this forest land as has been done by man and nature for more than 100 years.

Respectfully submitted,

ANNA OTT.

Stevenson, Wash.

HONORABLE MEMBERS OF U.S. SENATE: I will address my objections to this bill to one item. I have seen and heard many different figures as to the initial lost of purchasing land for this national scenic area from 200 million to 500 million dollars. I would like to know where that amount of money will come from. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers does not have enough money to clear downed trees and blackberry bushes from Home Valley Park right on the Columbia River in Skamania County, WA. Am I not correct that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers gets it operating funds from the same U.S. Treasury that the National Park Service gets its operating funds? If the corps doesn't have money for that sort of thing how can the Park Service have it?

It seems that in the last week radio-TV news-newspapers-news magazines say that unemployment is about like 1930–1939 era. Couldn't a little of that approximately half-billion be used to help private industry modernize and help create more jobs? That would be a much better use than buying up more land. The U.S. Government owns 90 percent of Skamania County now. That would make it worse to my way of thinking.

Yours truly,

Gerald Vasbinder.

P.O. Box 924,
White Salmon, Wash.

Senator Bob Packwood,
1220 SW. 3d,
Portland, Oreg.

Dear Senator Packwood: Considering the economic problems this country and the entire world is experiencing at this time, it is difficult for me to understand why legislation is now being considered that would place an additional burden on our governments budget.

Having lived and worked in the Gorge for the last twenty-four years I have observed no great change and see no immediate threat to the character of the Gorge. Repeating the "worst case scenario" over and over will not make it anymore true. This is what the proponents for Federal intervention in the management of the Gorge are doing to bring attention to a nonexisting problem.

As a strong statesman for your constituency you must prioritize the concerns of the nation and your state with answers of long term importance. I hope that you will not be trapped into linking the Bonneville Locks construction Bill with the "National Scenic Area" legislation. It will only muddy the waters of clear thinking.

Respectfully yours,

Karl E. Karlsson.

Pendleton Woolen Mills,
Portland, Oreg., February 4, 1983.

Senator Bob Packwood,
1220 SW. 3d Ave.,
Portland, Oreg.

Dear Senator Packwood: I hope this letter can be included in the testimony to be presented at your Commerce Committee hearing scheduled to be held in Hood River, Oregon on February 10, 1983. I will be out of town and unable to attend the hearing personally.

We wholeheartedly support the Columbia River Gorge Act, Senate Bill 2318, which you and Senator Hatfield co-sponsored in the last Congress. We have lived in Oregon all our lives and have been actively involved with the operation of the woolen mill in Washougal, Washington for over forty years.

In our opinion, the Columbia Gorge is the Pacific Northwest's most precious asset, and the protection of this asset should have the highest priority of all citizens in the area.

We hope you will re-introduce Senate Bill 2318 in the new Congress, and please call on us if we can be any help in the furthering its passage.

Very respectfully,

B. H. Bishop.

Mens Garden Club of Portland,
Portland, Oreg., February 4, 1983.

Hon. Bob Packwood,
United States Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Packwood: The Portland chapter of the Men's Garden Clubs of America proposed at their last meeting, held January 26, 1983, that "Senator Bob Packwood be notified they strongly endorse the proposal of the Friends of the Columbia River Gorge and that the Gorge be declared a National Scenic Area".

Also, "that communications be sent to all appropriate Government officials and agencies, urging every effort be made to preserve the beauty of the Columbia River Gorge".

Sincerely,

Jerry Benson, *President.*

Hood River County Chamber of Commerce,
Hood River, Oreg., February 4, 1983.

Senator Robert Packwood,
1220 SW., 3d, Portland, Oreg.

Dear Senator Packwood: The Hood River County Chamber of Commerce was just informed on Monday, February 1 that you would be chairing a subcommittee hearing on Thursday, February 10 in Hood River to air views concerning one phase of the Columbia Gorge future.

For several years we have periodically written letters to our Congressman, State Legislators, the President and many others interested in the future of the Columbia River Gorge.

We continue to support local control of the Columbia River Gorge. This same control has been a very successful sentry as can be seen by a drive along either side of the Gorge.

Employment is drastically down in the Mid-Columbia and there is a need for good full-time jobs, not merely the secondary jobs that are so often related to the type of tourism created by a National Park.

These are not the type of jobs that promote and maintain a healthy economy.

There are many thousands of people who have lived in the Gorge all their lives, raised families here, and enjoyed the noble magnificent beauty of this spectacular region.

Please do not ignore the good judgement of the many people whose home is the heart of the Columbia River Gorge.

Sincerely,

Tina O'Banion, *Manager.*

Stevenson Business Association,
Stevenson, Wash., February 7, 1983.

Senator Packwood,
1220 SW. 3d, Portland, Oreg.

Senator Packwood: The Stevenson Business Association would like to express its disappointment to being turned down by your office as a representative of our area to speak at the upcoming public hearing in Hood River regarding the Gorge issue. Since the focus of the hearing is on potential tourism in the Gorge, how it is to be managed and who is to manage it, it would seem that a core organization such as the Stevenson Business Association would be a reasonable and desirable speaker.

We, the Association, would also like to express our disapproval of national control of the Columbia Gorge and have attached a resolution stating our feelings on this matter.

We would hope that in making a decision regarding this matter, that all things are taken into view, not just the power and money of the metropolitan area. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Donna Rush,
Secretary/Treasurer.

Stop Taking Our Property,
Hood River, Oreg., February 7, 1983.

Senator Packwood,
1220 SW. 3d St., Portland, Oreg.

Dear Senator: This letter constitutes a formal demand that the testimony included herein be included in the written record of any hearing relative to Federal management or control of the Columbia Gorge. This also represents a formal protest of your lack of consideration for the public in not giving timely and wide notification of the proposed hearings, nor the specifics concerning the legislation being proposed. Additionally, we protest the prior selection of the parties to testify before the proposed hearing since such selection was not based upon timely imputs and requests to testify by the general public.

We emphatically state our objections to any Federal role in the management or control of privately owned property within the Columbia Gorge for the following reasons:

1. The government has demonstrated by numerous prior examples involving Federal parks and lands that it cannot be trusted in its assurances to safeguard the rights of private property against the intrusion of so-called "public interests". Many assurances are given that both private and public interests can be safeguarded at the same time. However, it is obvious that if the representatives of the public interest have the final authority and control, and if the proposed legislation contains insufficient constitutional barriers to creeping regulation and control, the private interests are always ultimately sacrificed to the public interests; if not in fact, then the ultimate potential still exists. We object to the insinuation that the traveling public has a greater right or even any right to the views and scenery which are part of private property. Were this legal precedent carried to its full extreme, there is no limit to the control that could be exercised upon private property which is desired for preservation by a special interest speaking as if they constituted the "public".

2. The only control of private property that we feel is appropriate is the prosecution of persons who by their actions and use of property directly and harmfully infringe on the property of others. These are prosecutable offenses, and can be handled as such. But we deny that any person has a visual right on other property. Thus there can be no legal grounds for the control of visual aspects of the property of another unless such property is purchased by voluntary contract from the owner. We object to the use of eminent domain condemnation of property under visual rights pretences.

3. We furthermore object to the bureaucratic processes of rulemaking, planning, zoning, and building codes which deny to the owner the right to be totally responsible for his own health, welfare, and safety as long as he is not directly or harmfuly infringing upon the property rights of others. It is clear from past examples that damage to an owner's ability to sell a property can occur by government designation of the property for "future" acquisition. With even a potential hint of condemnation procedures, all future buyers are discouraged from buying. Even the owner is discouraged from further improvements which may amount to effective denial of his use of such property.

4. We declare that it is impossible for bureaucrats to write regulations restricting or mandating scenic buffer zones or features which will not commonly result in some hardships and injustices to existing and future property owners. Requirements mandating screening vegetation may be so costly or impossible in certain areas of the gorge as to render the use of a piece of property financially unfeasible. Proposals in other areas to prohibit lights from being seen at night from roads are nearly impossible to accomplish.

5. We assert as residents of the Gorge that no additional laws are necessary to protect the scenic nature of the Gorge. Most of the Gorge is not capable of sustaining construction. Most parks within the gorge are rarely used to capacity due to the severe winds and climatic conditions here The construction of major man-made projects such as the large dams do not apparently detract from the gorge for the traveling public. Upon casual survey of the traveling public, there is, in fact, very little ever mentioned about detractions from the view. If large factory-like structures like dams do not bother the public, then it is highly speculative and without foundation that home construction would either. Even if it did bother the public, we would not recognize their protest as a right any more than I would have a right to protest the covering of Manhattan Island with high rise office buildings.

6. We object to "change of use" clauses which usually accompany written regulations embodied in land planning schemes. This, coupled with the fragile allowance for "grandfather rights" guarantees that eventually, every grandfather right will be negated over time. Land uses always change and will eventually subject all to these unjust controls. We assert that they are unjust because the use of land which does not directly or harmfully affect other property rights is not a legitimate area of coercion and control for government.

7. Though we cannot comment on the specifics of any proposed legislation, not being tendered even a notice of the meeting or an opportunity to secure a copy of legislation, we object to the normal general and pervasive language which abounds in such legislation giving unlimited and unrestricted powers to both elected and unelected officials.

8. We object to the false and deceptive suggestions of so-called "joint management" of the gorge by both Federal and local agencies. There is no such thing as

joint management. Some person or government body always will have the utlimate authority, and they are therefore the only true controlling force.

9. We object to the formulation of general land use goals that each property owner must comply with in gaining approval for construction or use of facilities on his property. To suggest and require that a private use must meet public needs is impossible in many situations. All needs are ultimately private and individual needs. We assert that there is no such thing as public need, but rather only the combination of individual needs into more powerful groups claiming to represent all. Society cannot operate consistently without the ultimate principle of individual ownership and control—as long as each owner is not infringing upon the property rights of others. A scenic view is not a property right of anyone except the actual owner.

10. Finally we object to the expenditure of any public funds to control private property, to condemn it for purchase or to increase the size of the governmental bureaucracies involved in such management schemes.

Please confirm by return mail the inclusion of this testimony in the record.

Very truly yours,

JOEL SKOUSEN, *Chairman.*

P.O. Box 531,
Carson, Wash., February 7, 1983.

Chairman Senator LARRY PRESSLER,
Senate Business Trade and Tourism Subcommittee.

DEAR CHAIRMAN: We object to the unfair practices and the violation of the rights of Gorge citizens by Senator Packwood's office, when scheduling and organizing the Columbia River Gorge Hearing for 2/10/83.

1. No official notification of the hearing.
2. Early release of news and preferential treatment given to the Friends of the Gorge.
3. Refusal to take calls about the Gorge hearing. Emily Barlow turned down 6 calls in one day, she was either on another line, out or not available.
4. The Gorge people were given no opportunity to speak.
5. We were told that written testimony would be accepted then regulations were set up giving us a matter of hours to submit that testimony. (Standard procedure allows written testimony to be submitted the day of the hearing—but we were informed late Sunday night that testimony had to be delivered by 4:00 p.m. Monday. That is 3 full days before the Thursday hearing.)
6. On Monday 1/31 Emily Barlow, Senator Packwood's office told me that the Skamania Co. Chamber of Commerce was on her list—but after checking with the Chamber of Sunday 2/6 I found that the Chamber had not received any communication whatsoever from Packwood's office.
7. Refusal to release information to our local newspaper—the Skamania Co. Pioneer.
8. 41,000 Gorge residents and property owners will be affected by this legislation—we demand more than a cursory and uncaring attitude by our elected officials.

CURTIS & SHERRY ESCH.

TRAILS CLUB OF OREGON,
CONSERVATION COMMITTEE,
Portland, Oreg., February 8, 1983.

DEAR SENATOR BOB PACKWOOD: Federal legislation is necessary in order to prevent deterioration of the Columbia River Gorge's unique scenic, geologic and recreational assets. With the completion of the new bridge across the Columbia there is imminent danger that the Gorge will be subjected to urban sprawl and industrial pollution. If this happens, those who reside within the Gorge would stand to lose the most, for they would daily be confronted with ugly scars.

A National Scenic Area designation would insure that the Gorge would not be exploited by developers interested only in economic gain. It is the latter who threaten the status of existing private land with the designated area.

The Columbia River Gorge is the legitimate concern of all citizens of Oregon and Washington. It is ours to enjoy, and ours to protect.

MARY B. MASON, *Chair.*

Vancouver, Wash., February 9, 1983.

Senator BOB PACKWOOD,
U.S. Senator, Washington D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PACKWOOD: I have lived in Vancouver, Washington for sixteen years and I have owned property in Skamania County for eleven years. It is with a great sense of urgency that I encourage you to push for the passage of the Columbia River Gorge Act of 1982. I believe we can waste no time in doing so because as each day passes those favoring local development are hatching new plans to delay and dispurse our efforts. There is obviously a great deal of money at stake here. For my family and I, there is the possible loss of one of the most beautiful scenic areas near a large urban area. I feel we will need these areas for many purposes, not the least of which is the rejuvenation of the soul. Because I have traveled quite extensively both within the United States, Europe, and Japan, I challenge those who live with the Columbia Gorge's great beauty everyday and want to develop it, to ask themselves if they truly see?

The National Scenic Area proposal seems to me to be the only honorable and just way of meeting the greatest number of people's needs and still protect the integrity of the area. Please do everything you can for passage of this legislation.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

ANNE OLWINE.

WASHOUGAL, WASH., *February 9, 1983.*

Members of the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee:

I wish to urge your support for and facilitation of designating the Columbia River Gorge as a National Scenic Area.

Having lived in Portland and Hood River, Oregon, and Camas/Washougal, Washington most of my life, I have learned to cherish and value the beauty and awesome wonder of Nature which the Gorge provides for locals and visitors alike. Over the years my attitude has changed from one of taking this "gift" for granted to one of deepening concern for preservation of its uniqueness "before it is too late."

I have been carefully following the regional controversy over Gorge management. I attended meetings of Governor Spellman's Select Committee and read the Committee's final recommendations, have attended many meetings or events (including the Vancouver City Council hearing regarding Scenic Area endorsement) at which many people expressed their reasons for favoring local control, and I have followed media coverage of this ongoing struggle. All this has strengthened my conviction that this issue is one of national significance and its solution must be entrusted solely to local landowners or their governing bodies.

Because the area of concern encompasses at least fifty governing bodies including two states, a primary problem is coordinated management. An honest observer of recent efforts at cooperation can not be hopeful. Of more concern to me is the past and potential exploitation through self-interest made possible by local-only management.

Just as we have acted to set aside such treasures as Yellowstone, Yosemite, and the Grand Canyon for the benefit of all citizens, now and for generations to come, I believe that national/regional management is vital to preserve the unique heritage of the Columbia River Gorge.

The threat of development is imminent. We must not delay; we must act now.

Respectfully,

PATRICIA L. BURNET.

COUNTY OF HOOD RIVER, BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,
Hood River Oreg., February 10, 1983.

Senator BOB PACKWOOD,
Chairman, Senate Commerce Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PACKWOOD: I understand that today's testimony will be confined to tourism and possible tourism development in the Gorge. Thus, I will only address that small segment of the larger question of federal control of the Gorge.

Initially it must be recognized that the Gorge's attraction is in it's visual, natural beauty and not as a destination recreational development. It is not a place where visitors stay for any notable period of time unless it is for the purpose of camping. It is a fact of economics that passing-through or outdoor camping tourists spend very little money in the area through which they pass or camp. A recent study by Pacific Economic a stated that a stay of at least three days is required before there can be an identifiable economic impact on the local commmunity. It is reasonable to conclude that the many viewers and campers who visit the Gorge do not, and will not, be assets to the economic growth of the towns and cities in the Gorge. Certainly almost all metropolitan Portland residents who visit the Gorge return home at the end of a day's viewing. It is bewildering to recognize that they are the ones who loudly proclaim that tourism will help the crippled economy of the Gorge communities when they spend so few dollars here.

Locally our big tourist event is a Blossom Day Sunday which attracts a few thousand people. However, it is not a Gorge activity as it accents the beauty of fruit blossoms in the valley. The money spent that day by tourists is for meals prepared by local social organizations and the mementos purchased are of local craft work. Little enters into the general commercial establishments, most of which are closed on Sundays.

I believe my first visit to the Gorge, in 1962, was typical of most tourists. As an Easterner, visiting the Northwest, I was staying at the old Multnomah Hotel in Portland. I ate breakfast there, bought some Portland gas for a rented car, and headed for the Gorge. The first stop was at Multnomah Falls where I gazed and took pictures on film bought in Portland. I didn't even buy a memento at the souvenier shop. Next came Bonneville Dam, where about an hour was spent watching the fish count and examining the things in the Visitors Center. Another half hour was spent at the fish hatchery. I passed by the Bridges of the Gods as I didn't want to go into Washington just yet. Lunch was bought in this very building, the Hood River Inn. I then went past The Dalles, intending to see Maryhill Museum. However, it was mid-August and the temperature around 100, so I stopped a few minutes at Celilo Falls and came back to The Dalles. I crossed into Washington at The Dalles Dam Bridge and headed back to Portland. Due to the narrow road and the greenery between the road and the river, not much Gorge was viewable. It was a great view from Cape Horn. Dinner was in some unremembered Portland downtown restaurant as day ended. I certainly was a big spender, about $3.75 for a lunch.

Since I became a resident of the Gorge, I have shown it to quite a few out-of-state visitors and the pattern remains practically identical. They want to see everything possible in the time limitations of vacations.

When one is enjoying the natural beauty of the Gorge, there is no desire to leave the highway to look at any of the few small towns adjacent to the road. Remember that in Oregon the interstate highway bypasses all of the local communities, none of which have any tourist attraction save the boat rides, seasonally, at Cascade Locks. The proposal for a tramway to attract tourists at Cascade Locks was shot down principally by the combined Gorge Commissions of Oregon and Washington. I ask, "Where are the accommodations for a large tourist industry?" The tourist oriented businesses such as this hotel normally have plenty of rooms available, without reservations, for the touring public. In fact on the first Friday of this past November, this hotel in which we are meeting had an occupancy of only ten rooms, two of which were occupied by my friends. Is any other hotel chain going to build a big complex for tourists who will probably return to Portland for the night anyway? This very hotel has announced expansion plans several times, only to cancel them in view of the realities of economics. The great plans for the Columbia Gorge Hotel ended in bankruptcy court.

Are those who envision a large tourist industry for the Gorge as a result of federal scenic legislation going to permit construction of new hotels, restaurants, gas stations, souvenier shops, and all of the many other tourist trap enticements in the Gorge? They cannot permit these and still maintain the natural beauty of the Gorge which they seek to preserve.

Tourism in the Gorge may be a wonderful thing for the business establishments of Portland, but it will do very, very little to improve the sad economic state of the Gorge communities.

I hope that at some future date I will be permitted to address you on the realities of impending population growth in the Gorge. It is as fictional as is the theory that we will prosper locally because of tourism.

Respectfully,

GLENN E. PALMER,
Commissioner.

STATE OF WASHINGTON, COMMERCE & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT,
Olympia, Wash., February 10, 1983.

Hon. ROBERT PACKWOOD,
U.S. Senator, Ste. 385, 122 S.W. Third, Portland, Oreg.

DEAR SENATOR PACKWOOD: Thank you very much for your invitation to testify on tourism opportunities in the Columbia River Gorge at your February 10 hearing at Hood River. Unfortunately, because of pressing legislative commitments here in Olympia, we cannot appear before you today.

Washington State is committed to an intensified tourism development program. In this regard, we have been actively working with local and regional groups in Southwest Washington to enhance opportunities for tourism growth in the Columbia River Gorge area. The state of Washington is promoting the scenic splendor of the Columbia River Gorge as a major attraction and destination for visitors to our state. We are also currently engaged in various studies of this area in cooperation with the federal government (EDA), local and regional tourism development groups. We shall make the findings of these studies available to you as soon as they are completed. Enclosed you will find copies of promotional materials produced by our state which relate to the Columbia River Gorge.

We appreciate your interest in this regard and look forward to working with you to enhance the tourism potential in the Columbia River Gorge.

Sincerely,

RICHARD T. SCHROCK, *Director.*

Underwood, Wash., February 10, 1983.

Senator ROBERT PACKWOOD,
Washington D.C.

GENTLEMAN: There is no doubt in my mind that the times call for immediate action to provide firm, lasting, and wise protection to the fragile beauty of the Columbia River Gorge, that administration of the entire Gorge as a single entity is essential to the accomplishment of this end, and that no such timely and unified action can be expected from the two states and the six counties. It therefore appears to me essential that the federal government take the lead in providing the necessary protection, and that National Scenic Area status constitutes the most workable means for providing the needed protection with adequate safeguards for the economic, political and personal interests of those residing in the Gorge.

The two bills introduced in 1982 should serve as an excellent framework on which to build fair and effective enabling legislation for 1983 and with added safeguards to minimize the possiblity of administrative excess, I see no reason to doubt that this legislation will pass in 1983.

The "Packwood" bill seems to me to provide the better overall basis for a workable administrative plan, and the Commission composition it provides seems to me to be less likely to be influenced adversely by the pressures of special interests. However, the "Wyden" bill gives greater response to the people in the area by giving greater power to the Commission. I hold this to be proper, and quite safe from selfish pressures if the larger Commission composition prevails. In a government of, by and for the people, input from and easy redress of grievances for the people most affected should be provided to the greatest extent consistent with firm and provided to the greatest extent consistent with firm and effective administration of the aims of the legislation.

I believe that the administrative agency should serve an "executive" function, and that the Commission should have both quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial powers. Powers granted to the administrator should be limited to those necessary to provide parklands and recreational facilities for public use, and to preserve the scenic beauty as seen from those areas and from the Columbia river and the shoreline highways. Federal powers should be minimal with regard to private lands not visible from parklands, river, or shoreline highways, even if such lands are included in designated "critical areas"—and this should be explicitly stated in the bill.

Much of my thinking in support of these recommendations is expressed in the statement to Governor Spellman attached.

Sincerely,

U. L. UPSON.

STATEMENT OF U. L. UPSON

I have known and loved the Columbia River Gorge since my father first drove our family around Crown Point and past the many waterfalls to and through the Mitchell Point tunnel, in an open-top touring car in 1921. Later, and until WWII, I hiked nearly all the trails on both sides of the Gorge; and though employment took our family elsewhere for most of the intervening years, my wife and I returned to the Gorge to spend the rest of our lives here.

Our home overlooks the Gorge from atop a bluff, some 1100 feet above the river, so we are living in an area to be designated as "critical" under the terms of the proposed legislation, and thus subject to any strictures imposed on such areas. Also, since we bought adjoining land as a hedge against inflation, we, like many of our neighbors, will be affected by any restrictions on the use or sale of this property.

However, we strongly feel that local governments are both disinclined and unable to properly protect the fragile values of the Gorge; and we see federal administration of the Gorge *as a single entity* as the only effective means presently available to accomplish this end. Because of the inadequacies of local government, we have become involved in activities to achieve the needed protection, joining the Columbia Gorge Coalition and the Friends of the Columbia Gorge, and being co-plaintiffs with others in bringing suit against Skamania County and a developer, George Rizor, to negate an evasion of both state and county laws—successfully.

Although we ourselves fully support the National Scenic Area concept, we are acutely aware of the fears and concerns of our neighbors in this regard; and while we believe their fears are largely based on deliberately mis-stated "scare stories", we respect the sincerity of their concerns, and believe that special effort should be made to ensure that the kinds of excesses the people have been led to fear are banned by the legislation. (Opposition to the legislation has full official sanction in Skamania county. Propagandist Chuck Cushman was first brought into the county at public expense, public buses are used to pack meetings and hearings with "anti-fed" people—even to Portland, and the campaign against the legislation operates largely out of County and P.U.D. offices.)

While still fully favoring legislation to create an NSA in the Gorge, I personally do not feel that either of the bills introduced in 1982 reflects either all my own views or the full nature of the discussions held by the Board of the Friends during the formulation of our draft bill. In those meetings we all concurred on the need to impose restrictions on the visual effects of residential construction in the Gorge (screening, low-contrast coloration, etc.), but we did not seek to ban ALL further residential use outside the incorporated areas. (In building our home, my wife and I chose to make it virtually invisible from the river or the highways, clearing as little as possible, leaving screening trees between the house and the Gorge, and staining the rough cedar siding in earth tones of brown and green.

In contrast, a new neighbor cleared his land from line to line and erected a harsh monument to his ego, intentionally visible for miles! It is this kind of visual damage we wish to prevent.)

Even within areas designated as critical there is much land which is in no way visible from the river or from either highway, and it was never the Board majority's intent that these unseen areas should be subject to the same restrictions as would apply to the visible sites.

In considering the form of administration to be recommended, the Board agreed to give primary policy-making power to the county/bi-state/federal Commission rather than to the administering agency, and to make it possible to appear administrative action to the Commission prior to final appeal to the federal court system, so that appellants would not be required to travel to San Francisco or Washington, DC.

In the rush of preparing our draft bill, and considering the unwieldy process of obtaining Board consensus on all decisions, the above moderations were not made apparent in the draft bill submitted to the Oregon congressional delegation, and, perhaps consequentially, did not find expression in the bills introduced in 1982.

No one is more determined than I that full and firm protection of the scentic values of the Gorge be enacted into law. I have been deeply involved in such actions for many decades—since before the Wilderness bill was passed; but I also am deeply committed to the preservation of the democratic processes, to a free society, and to government by and for the people. I do not believe that these two goals are at all in conflict. With carefully drawn up legislation in which the limits of action and of power are as well defined and explicit as are the aims and powers granted by the legislation, we can achieve both objectives. Good legislation is in the end *strong* legislation!

At a time when distrust of government, and of federal government in particular, is at what seems to be an all-time high, we gravely need to demonstrate that government CAN be fair and wise and effective—even as much as we need to protect the beauty of the Gorge.

I believe we can do both.

William P. Macht Associates,
Hood River, Oreg., February 10, 1983.

Senator **Robert Packwood,**
Chairman, Subcommittee on Business, Trade & Tourism, Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Dirksen Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Packwood: This testimony for your Columbia Gorge hearing today in Hood River is submitted as a private citizen and not as a professor of planning law at the Graduate School of Urban and Public Affairs at Portland State University.

Last session's bills (S. 2318 and S. 2319, 97th Cong., 2d) provide a useful framework for a regional approach to protection of the Gorge. However, they do not adequately address the need or process for economic development within the Gorge, or for urban development within the existing cities. Scenic area designation itself can be an economic benefit to existing communities, but they need a variety of specific planning and development project assistance to capture the economic opportunities created.

The proposed Regional Commission advisory to the Secretarty of Agriculture should be reconstituted as an independent, bi-state, federally chartered corporation (for simplicity, called herein the Columbia Gorge Corporation-CGC). In addition to its regional planning role, the CGC should function both as a development bank and as a land bank.

As a development bank, the CGC should be able to finance the planning and development of specific projects beneficial to the local and regional economy. It should have power to streamline the development process for projects it assists, and to gain access to capital markets otherwise unavailable to local public and private entities.

As a land bank, the CGC should use its development profits to acquire scenic easements, development rights or outright purchase of critical lands. It should arrange land swaps between public and private entities. It should recapture the increase in land values created by governmental activities, and it should sell or lease for appropriate development as the need arises. It should also be able to issue its own bonds for the purchase of lands of willing sellers.

The CGC should become a self-funding corporation. The federal government should provide initial seed capital as well as enough callable capital to permit CGC to enter private capital markets. In addition, federal, state and local governments should subscribe to the capital of CGC with payment in public lands or development rights on those lands.

These proposals merely summarize an alternative approach which combines development with conservation, which couples development banking with land banking, which uses federal authority to overcome jurisdictional multiplicity and rivalry but retains effective regional and local control. If you or your staff find merit in this course, I would be delighted to discuss it in further detail. I also attach a position paper dealing with business and tourism issues in the context of a waterfront development plan for Hood River.

Sincerely yours,

William P. Macht.

Protect the Gorge Committee,
Vancouver, Wash., February 10, 1983.

Hon. **Bob Packwood,**
Chairman, Senate Commerce Committee, 1220 SW Third No. 385, Portland, Oreg.

Dear Bob: Please let me preface our written comments for the subcommittee record with an expression of deep concern over the scheduling and the orchestration of this hearing today.

Our organization was formed and is accomplishing substantial gain toward fashioning a regional alternative, short of federal dominance, for the future of the Columbia River Gorge. We have sought to reassure local officials and local citizens that they can and must be heard in shaping a consensus for the future of this unique treasure. We remain convinced, and seek to convince others, that an open, methodical, constructive dialogue which recognizes the integrity of local government is a process welcomed and encouraged by all of those at all levels of government who exercise leadership in resolving this important matter.

We are keenly disappointed that such a perspective has been excluded from the formal process today.

Further, while tourism aspects of the Gorge issue are important and worthy considerations, the record should remain clear that federal attention to the Columbia Gorge is catalyzed by perceived and potential land use practices within its sensitive areas. We believe that intergovernmental relationships, environmental and economic interests, and regional initiative must all be respected in resolving this delicate issue for the common good.

Your office has been provided with substantial backgrounding materials from our organization which should be a part of the official record today. We would additionally offer you the following observations:

Economic well-being and diversity for the region, to include tourism, must be a corollary objective while preserving the scenic and environmental qualities of the Columbia Gorge. Local, regional, and state initiative is at work and growing; and facilitation at the federal level is welcomed. The chilling effect from the Columbia River Gorge Act of 1982 hindered rather than helped in the effort, however.

The enhancement and promotion of specific resources—lodging and resort complexes, for example, as are found on both sides of the River—can be of significant benefit to the area. Financial aid or other incentives to tourism efforts by Oregon and Washington may be welcomed as they work through their local Chambers of Commerce and other organizations in discrete marketing efforts, without chilling effect on local decision-making.

The proximity of the Columbia Gorge to metropolitan Portland bears directly upon the ability to develop tourism resource in the Gorge itself. It is possible to have the best of a scenic wonder and metropolitan exposure within hours of the same day, and that issue must be examined carefully to ascertain the real cost-benefits to proposed federal dominance of the landscape. A factor in the equation is certainly the opinion of leaders and the citizens within the Gorge proper.

Lastly, we would ask that both environmental and full economic impact analyses be concluded as a part of considering any proposed federal legislation affecting the area. Our belief remains that a balanced planning effort, responsive to the treasure and its enhancement potential and with accountability close to home, can respond to environmental and economic analyses. We are far less certain that federal legislation as heretofore proposed can do so.

Senator Packwood, we seek balance planning and a political consensus in achieving mutual objectives regarding the future of the Gorge. The impetus for this hearing today is drawn from neither, and we ask for your leadership accordingly.

Very truly yours,

Stanley Bishoprick, *Chairman.*

Mt. St. Helens Club,
Kelso, Wash., February 11, 1983.

Senator Packwood,
145 Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Below is a copy of a statement which was to be included in the record of the hearing scheduled last fall by Senator Mark Hatfield's Energy Committee. As you know this hearing was never held. It was impossible for any of our group to attend the hearing held in Hood River on Feb. 10. We would therefore appreciate having the statements below included in the record of that hearing.

The Mt. St. Helens Club is a group primarily interested in the enjoyment of the outdoors. It is based in the Longview—Kelso area and has approximately 95 members.

One of the objectives of the club is as follows: "To preserve, by personal carefulness and protective legislative, the natural beauties of the Pacific Northwest."

We believe the Columbia Gorge is one of the natural beauties of this area and should be protected and preserved for the enjoyment of all citizens. Therefore we are in favor of any legislation which, as much as possible, protects the area. We are also in favor of having this area designated as The Columbia National Scenic Area.

Elsie Stoller,
Conservation Chairman.

Vancouver, Wash., February 12, 1983.

Hon. Bob Packwood,
Chairman, Senate Commerce Committee, 120 SW Third #385, Portland, Oreg.

Dear Senator Packwood: I requested of your staff an opportunity to testify at the Hood River Hearing, but was told that I would have to make written comment.

My comments are based on 45 years personal knowledge of the Columbia River Gorge, 4 years as Forest Supervisor of the Gifford Pinchot N.F., and some 20 years in a management position with the Forest Service where we developed procedures and standards to coordinate management of scenic and timber resources.

1. The proponents for a national scenic area have not demonstrated that the scenic resources are significantly threatened. I have been travelling up and down the Gorge for 45 years. In my opinion the scenic qualities are as good, if not better that ever. The environmentalists have had a propoganda blitz in high gear for several years. They have distorted the facts continuously. Nancy Russell shows beautiful slides of the area and tells about the unique plants and animal life and implys they will be lost if the Gorge is not made a national scenic area. She does not tell the location of each subject, many of which are probably located on national forest or state park lands and already protected. An example of their misleading propoganda, is the Risor development tract on the Washington side. Repetitive newspaper articles emphasized that this tract was opposite Multnomah Falls, and therefore must be stopped. They implied that development (24 home sites on 65 acres) would desecrate the view from Multnomah Falls. After Rizor had cleared the timber from the home sites and built the service roads, my wife and I made a trip to Eastern Oregon. We travelled up the Oregon shore and back on Washington S.H. #14. We stopped at Multnomah Falls and looked for the Rizor tract clearing. We looked for it on our return. In neither case could we locate the supposed scar on the landscape.

2. No recognition has been given to opportunities to consider alternative scenic quality standards. Instead the land use controversy has evolved around two polarized positions, ie, either untouched nature or no restraints at all. The Forest Service has developed a very professional set of scenic quality standards and objectives together with the procedure for coordinating the management of scenery and other resource and activity. There process makes it possible for a decision maker to examine various management options each with a different trade-off and choose the option that best meets identified objectives.

Pre-mature federal legislation would preempt the opportunity to apply or consider such alternatives. As a must, federal proposals should be preceeded by a visual resource inventory and analysis of different management alternatives and the attendant trade-off between scenic quality levels and other resource uses.

3. The Columbia River Gorge is without question the most important transportation corridor in the Western United States. The economy of NW Oregon and SW Washington is heavily dependent upon these multiple transportation facilities. With scenic legislation, there is danger that provisions for protecting scenery would forestall continued improvement or development of transportation facilities. This must not happen. However, in such development consideration must be given to minimizing impacts on scenic resources.

4. Renewable natural resources are an important economic asset of the Gorge. I am strongly convinced that we can and must continue to manage these resources, and do it in harmony with maintaining a pleasing and attractive scenic resource. It concerns me when the phrase "protect the scenic resource" is stated as an objective. What constitutes adequate protection? The answer is in the eyes of the beholder. To environmental groups it is complete protection wherein man does not interfere with nature. They do not accept positive scenic managment. Therein lies conflict in implementing legislation to " protect scenery". Flexibility in managing scenic resources is an essential requisite for the economic health of the region and Skamania County in particular.

5. Everyone agrees that increasing tourism is desirable. However, to do so requires development of not only lodging and service facilities, but also those facilities that will give the tourist something to do besides looking at outstanding scenery. Opposition arises quickly when a tourist facility is proposed that may modify a natural scenic view. Examples, are past proposals to build a tourist tramway to a view point in the Gorge. The same environmentalists that are proponents for a national scenic area, succeeded in stopping such development. Any legislative proposal must insure that physical facilities needed to help tourists see and enjoy more of the Gorge area have priority over maintaining a "natural scene". Most tourists are not offended by man's activities, in fact if properly done they can become an important part of a tourist attraction. I was interested in noting, as one of many tourists at a

Mount St. Helens viewpoint parking lot on labor day, that the tourists seemed to be as interested in seeing the adjoining salvage logging activity as they were the destruction caused by the volcano. (Yet Congress has prohibited future logging at that site, once salvage is completed.)

6. It is understood that the County Commissioners of Clark, Skamania, and Klickitat Counties have recently signed an inter-local agreement to coordinate their planning, to adopt in concept Governor Spellman's Select Committee Planning Document, and to work towards establishing a Commission with oversight and compliance enforcement responsibilities.

7. The Federal Government is broke. Thus, it is ever more important for the federal government to only do those things that states and local government can not do for themselves. Considering the state of our nation's economy, it is unconscionable to consider giving priority to un-modified scenic values at a cost of foregoing the economic and public benefits that can be derived from a balanced resource (including scenery) management program.

I oppose federal legislation for the above reasons and because flexibility in the management and use of Columbia River Gorge resources is necessary to attain maximum public benefit. Federal legislation would almost certainly be unduly rigid and overly complex and costly to administer. Recent federal legislation bears this out. For example, the 1976 National Forest Management Act and the 1982 Mount St. Helens Volcanic Monument Act illustrates that the powerful environmental lobbies dominate Congress and effectively turn proposed legislation for conservation and wise use of natural resources into preservation legislation.

I request that my statement be entered in the Hearing Record.

Sincerely,

C. Glen Jorgensen.

Portland, Oreg., February 12, 1983.

Senator Bob Packwood,
1220 SW 3rd Ave., Portland, Oreg.

Dear Senator Packwood: In July 1982 the State of Oregon demolished the historic Hood River Bridge, the longest remaining bridge on the Old Columbia River Highway, despite the efforts of the Historic Preservation League, Gorge Commission, Friends of the Gorge, and your office. This short-sighted action symbolizes why National Scenic Area designation is needed now to protect the endangered scenic, recreational, and cultural resources of the Gorge.

The State refused to delay this demolition for five years, for fear of losing federal demolition money. The State Historic Preservation Office was afraid or unwilling to change its 1979 opinion that the bridge was "not eligible" for the National Register. Although many local residents disagreed, the Chairman of the Hood River County Commission pushed for a quick demolition under the mistaken notion that the bridge had been "condemned" by the federal government. It was structurally sound but outmoded for large vehicles. Our federal, state, and local officials failed to see beyond the confines of their regulations and the easy money available for bridge demolition by the feds.

Although the National Park Service prepared a complete inventory of the Columbia River Highway in 1981, the State of Oregon has not yet pursued National Register status for the highway, which could give interim protection to these resources. Since most original bridges and structures are also suffering from old age, other Columbia River Highway features can also be "condemned" and demolished without consideration of their cultural and recreational value. This tragedy should not happen again.

The Old Columbia River Highway (including abandoned sections) could again provide a basic recreational parkway/trail from Troutdale to the Dalles, as part of a National Scenic Area. If the Highway is rehabilitated and designated as a national historic parkway (such as found in the Eastern U.S.) it would easily attract national tourism, as it did when it was built.

It is difficult for me to see why the State of Oregon built and then abandoned the nation's finest scenic parkway. Fortunately, much of is still there, waiting to be reclaimed and reused in a National Scenic Area.

Please enter this letter in the record of the Feb. 10, 1983 hearing.

Very sincerely yours,

Richard N. Ross.

Stevenson Wash., February 18, 1983.

Hon. BOB PACKWOOD,
1220 S.W. 3rd St., Portland, Oreg.

I submit the following testimony to the Subcommittee on Trade and Tourism, of the Senate Commerce Committee:

The Columbia River Gorge is not one gorge but three. From Hood River west the two sides are as different as a cow is from an elephant. To impose the same management plan on both sides would destroy what you seek to protect. The eastern end is similar on both sides but needs a management plan tailored to it's specific needs.

Imposing the limitations of your Gorge bill on Skamania County would lead to economic catastrophe. Tourism could not possibly provide jobs soon enough to avoid economic disaster. Besides, if you limit growth to existing incorporated areas, where will you house your tourism workers? In Portland? The present resident work force are loggers and mill workers. You never could make waitresses and waiters out of them.

Fanatical special interest groups are notoriously deaf and blind to reality.

ROBERT W. BARNES.

OREGON SOCIETY OF AMERICAN FORESTERS,
Roseburg, Oreg., Feb. 22, 1983.

Senator BOB PACKWOOD,
1220 SW 3d, Suite 385, Portland, Oreg.

DEAR SENATOR PACKWOOD: We understand that you held a hearing on February 10, 1983, for the Senate Subcommittee on Commerce and Tourism in Hood River, Oregon, concerning possible future legislation on the management and protection of the Columbia River Gorge.

The Oregon Society of American Foresters, representing 1800 professional foresters throughout the state, is concerned about management of the Columbia River Gorge and has adopted the enclosed position statement.

Although we understand hearing testimony was oriented to functions of the subcommittee, we respectfully request the position statement of the Oregon Society of American Foresters on "Management of the Columbia River Gorge" be made part of the official hearing transcript.

Should you have questions regarding our position, please contact Mr. Doug Coyle, Chairman, Legislation and Policy Committee at (503) 378-2559.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT L. ALVERTS, *Chairman.*

MANAGEMENT OF THE COLUMBIA RIVER GORGE

The Oregon Society of American Foresters supports "Forest Policies of the Society of American Foresters, 1981", the purpose of which is to assist the profession in advancing the science, technology, education, and practice of professional Forestry in America. With their skills, foresters are professionally qualified in the management of forest land to provide the variety of goods and services necessary to meet the need of society in general. Professional foresters must be involved at all stages when considering forest land related values.

We are concerned that the current controversy over future management of the Columbia Gorge focuses on scenic values to the exclusion of other resource values. We recognize the Gorge does possess many resource values not the least of which is scenery. The rich variety in scenery has existed for many years because of the vegetative changes due to natural and man-caused fires. As the region developed, further changes occurred as timber stands were harvested for lumber and agriculture. Many of these areas have reforested over time which adds greatly to the current scenic resource in the Gorge as it exists today. With the century drawing to a close, there have been increasing pressures to develop the lands remaining in private ownership for residential and industrial purposes.

Recognition of all the resources and values in the Gorge must be given. These resources include, but are not limited to, scenery, timber, fish, wildlife, agriculture, recreation, water, minerals, energy, culture, and last but certainly not least, transportation. With concern for the management of all these resources vested in the particular interest of many public, private, and industrial organizations, coordination, and local land use planning offers the most promise to resolve the inevitable conflicts that will arise among these interests. The land use decision making process should balance economic, social, and environmental considerations and should encourage active participation by the public. In order to achieve this balance, the values being considered should be inventoried in accordance with the need and intended use. Then through a coordinated local land use planning process the goals and objectives for the Columbia River Gorge should be defined and agreed upon. Professional foresters can provide sound technical advice to planners and feasible alternatives for achieving forest associated goals and objectives.

The Oregon Society of American Foresters therefore, takes the position that the States of Oregon and Washington accept the ultimate responsibility for establishing local land use goals, objectives, inventories, and plans which will provide for harmonious management of all the resource values inherent in the Columbia River Gorge and to the mutual benefit of all public, private, and industrial interests. We further suggest the respective States provide for equal representation on the part of all interests concerned in the establishment and administration of these land use goals, and professional foresters must be involved at all stages when considering forest land related values.

ABOUT THE SOCIETY

The Oregon Society of American Foresters, with about 1900 members, is the local unit of the Society of American Foresters, with about 21,000 members, which is the national organization representing all segments of the forestry profession of the United States including public and private practitioners, researchers, administrators, educators, and forestry students.

Objectives of the Society are to advance the science, technology, teaching, and practice of professional forestry in America, and to use the knowledge and skills of the profession to benefit society.

Gifford Pinchot and six other pioneer foresters established the Society in 1900.

Members subscribe to a code of professional ethics. The Society is the accreditation authority for professional forestry education in the United States. Its periodicals are the Journal of Forestry, Forest Science, Southern Journal of Applied Forestry, and Proceedings of the SAF national conventions.

Stevenson, Wash., February 24, 1983.

Senator Bob Packwood,
Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Packwood: While I am a member of the Washington Columbia River Gorge Commission, I am writing today as a private citizen concerned with the future protection of the Columbia Gorge. My home for 21 years has been Skamania County, in the heart of the Gorge. Before my retirement I worked as a Washington State University extension agent, with responsibilities for resource development and forestry.

Over the years, I have repeatedly witnessed environmental requests relating to protection of the Gorge's natural beauty set aside or entirely dismissed. I am cognizant of the power structure which so ably seeks out and gets public support for its own short-term financial gain, regardless of the cost to the Gorge itself. Yet, I also recognize the need to provide reasonable protection of an individual's property rights and to ensure that Gorge communities remain economically functional.

The fears of some Skamania County residents and those living in the Portland/Vancouver metropolitan area that ill-conceived, poorly-planned development will trigger loss of natural beauty in the Gorge are, in my opinion, valid. Recent benchmark analysis of Skamania County lands identified as critical in the proposed federal legislation reveal the fact that a shocking 60 percent of the landowners are absentees, with an average parcel size of 24 acres. This funding is further supported by the fact that 23 percent of the western portion (10,500 acres, lying between Beacon Rock and the county's west boundary) of Skamania County land within the statutory boundary of the Gorge has been divided into parcels 20 acres or smaller.

Developing a strong tourist industry can be complementary with the Gorge's spectacular scenery, as well as provide a means whereby residents can maintain their property and livelihood. Local citizens would find increased employment opportunities and an incentive to protect the natural resources of the Gorge would be generated.

There have been several studies of the potential economic impact of tourism in the Gorge. Detailed economic studies made in the Gorge under the auspices of the

Mid-Columbia Economic Development District [1] showed that 41 percent of the people interviewed at the Bonneville Dam on the Columbia River were from states other than Washington, Oregon, California or Idaho. The findings further pointed out that the average overnight visitor to the Gorge spent $27.57 within the area.

I am also deeply concerned about acquisition and condemnation procedures. While acquisition of land in fee and less-than-fee is a necessary conservation aid, it should be limited to instances where no other techniques, such as land use controls, subsidies or incentives, is practical. Such condemnation authority should rest with the regional commission. Under no circumstances should condemnation be initiated without prior regional commission approval.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my comments.

Respectfully submitted,

Dick Adlard.

Oregon Roadside Council,
Portland, Oreg., February 24, 1983.

Senator Bob Packwood,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Packwood: The Oregon Roadside Council was founded in 1932 with dedication to the preservation and enhancement of Oregon's scenic beauty, in particular, those areas which adjoin the highways of this State.

The preservation of the Columbia River Gorge, with all its magnificant splendor, has been a primary goal since the beginning or our organization.

As there has been expressed for many years a mutual interest by both the state of Oregon and the state of Washington to preserve the scenic beauty of the Columbia River Gorge, it would seem a simple matter for representatives of these two states to act in concert for the protection of the Gorge. However, this has not happened. Vested interests have placed pressures upon politicians, committees and commissions which have diluted the primary goal and so after years and years of attempting unison of interstate interests the program for the preservation of the Columbia River Gorge still founders.

Now time, truly, becomes an important issue. As the development of this region accelerates, special interests, seeking capitalization of this natural phenonema, increase their lobbying. Unless action is soon taken for adopting an appropriate management plan, we shall forever lose; bit by bit; area by area; the Gorge heritage.

The decision must be made now. Control must be outside the, often-times, petty vested and political pressures of state bodies.

The Oregon Roadside Council stands with the Friends of the Columbia Gorge for Federal designation and control of this invaluable asset.

Sincerely yours,

Alex Pierce, *President.*

Industrial Forestry Association,
Portland, Oreg., February 25, 1983.

Senator Bob Packwood,
Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Senator Packwood: Please insert into the hearing record the following comments. We understand the record is open until February 25.

Industrial Forestry Association represents both major industry forest landowners and purchasers of public timber in the Douglas Fir Region of the Pacific Northwest. In the Columbia River Gorge we represent 12 forest landowning companies, 11 of which also purchase public timber. Collectively, these landowers represent 37,000 acres of forest land on both sides of the river. Ownership size varies from approximately 12,000 acres to 80 acres; some of the land they own has been logged twice and has been in company ownership for 40 years of more.

Our members object to being excluded from any hearings regarding the future of forest land management in the Gorge. We are a part of the commerce, trade and to a limited degree tourism in the Gorge.

---

[1] From WICHE Study "Proposed Tramway Analysis for the Port of Cascade Locks," by Wilber Conder, Larry McCollum and Morton Michelson, 1971.

Senator Packwood at his February 10th hearing stated that the purpose of the hearing was for him to hear people's thoughts on who should manage the Gorge and how should the Gorge be managed.

Our members are concerned that the control of private forest land use by any federal government agency is a duplication of authority that already exists within the land use laws of both the States of Oregon and Washington, the regulatory authority of both state's Forest Practices Acts and other state and country laws. As far as we can tell, no existing agency will be eliminated by the passage of the proposed legislation. So why do we need any federal agency to administer private forest land currently administered by the States of Oregon and Washington?

We object to having approximately 4,000 acres of our land being subjectively classified critical and subject to condemnation without any definition as to what constitues critical land and without any public input.

We object to any bill that assumes existing private forest land use and practices are contrary to being compatible with other existing private forest land use and practices are contrary to being compatible with other existing uses in the Gorge. Section 5(b)(3) of S. 2318 and Section 6(b)(3) of S. 2319 provide that the Management Plan will "designate appropriate uses of all lands within the Gorge area." The bills do not acknowledge that any existing uses are appropriate and there is a clear intent expressed that all non-conforming uses will be put to an end.

We object to the federal government developing both a visual management plan for private forest lands in the Gorge and a management plan for the entire NSA. The Forest Service manages their land in the Gorge for recreation and visual management with practically no timber harvest available from either the Forest Service or the Bureau of Land Management. We think any plan developed by any government agency will be biased toward their management or lack of management practices and a "taking of our rights" not recognized with any form of compensation in the bill.

We object to an artificial condemnation cap of 10 percent on the total gross area within the Gorge. Within the NSA approximately 150,000 acres are in land uses that will not be subject to change, i.e., pools behind dams, interstate and state highways, power and gas transmission lines, etc. Any economic growth is thereby restricted to a smaller land base without valid justification.

We prefer that the counties be given two or more years to complete any land use plans and zoning regulations, including Gorge overlays before there is only congressional action.

Sincerely,

Philo Gregg, *District Forester.*

○

ERRATA

Columbia River Gorge

The Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee hearing re the "Columbia River Gorge" was inadvertently not assigned a publication number.

The correct designation is S. Hrg. 98-25.

○

S261-24